

Metropolitan regions and spatial development: part 4, Metropolitan regions as a new spatial planning concept - aspects of implementation, using the example of South-Western Germany

Megerle, Heidi Elisabeth

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Monographie / monograph

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (ARL)

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Megerle, H. E. (2009). *Metropolitan regions and spatial development: part 4, Metropolitan regions as a new spatial planning concept - aspects of implementation, using the example of South-Western Germany*. (Studies in Spatial Development, 8). Hannover: Verl. d. ARL. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-285613>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Metropolitan Regions and Spatial Development

Part 4

Heidi Elisabeth Megerle

Metropolitan Regions as a New Spatial Planning Concept

Aspects of Implementation, Using the Example
of South-Western Germany



Metropolitan Regions as a New Spatial Planning Concept
Aspects of Implementation, Using the Example of South-Western Germany



A sign on the side of B 27 at the border between the Stuttgart Regional Association and the Neckar/Alb Regional Association (Megerle 2008).
It reads: Welcome! Here begins the future



PRINTED ON PAPER AWARDED WITH THE EU ECO-LABEL

SSD No. 8
ISBN: 978-3-88838-234-5
ISSN 1619-1986

All rights reserved • Published by ARL • Hanover, Germany 2009
©Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung
(Academy for Spatial Research and Planning)
Layout: M. Kappenberg, O. Rose
Printed in Germany by poppdruck, 30851 Langenhagen

Ordering possibilities:

via book trade

VSB-Verlagsservice Braunschweig
Postfach 47 38
38037 Braunschweig
Germany

Tel. (+49-18 05) 7 08-7 09

Fax (+49-5 31) 7 08-6 19

E-Mail: vsb-bestellservice@westermann.de

Onlineshop of the ARL: www.ARL-net.de

Publisher's address:

Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (ARL®)
Leibniz-Forum für Raumwissenschaften
Hohenzollernstraße 11, 30161 Hannover, Germany
Tel. (+49-5 11) 3 48 42-0, Fax (+49-5 11) 3 48 42-41
E-Mail: ARL@ARL-net.de
Internet: www.ARL-net.de

Academy for Spatial Research and Planning



STUDIES IN
SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT

Metropolitan Regions and Spatial Development

Part 4

Heidi Elisabeth Megerle

Metropolitan Regions as a New Spatial Planning Concept

Aspects of Implementation, Using the Example
of South-Western Germany

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Table of contents | V |
| List of figures, maps and tables | VIII |
| List of abbreviations for the figures and other abbreviations | XI |
| Preface | XII |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Part I Methodological, theoretical and conceptual basis | 3 |
| 1 Methodological basis | 3 |
| 1.1 Data Sources and methodological approach | 3 |
| 2 Theoretical and conceptual basis | 6 |
| 2.1 Metropolis and metropolitan region – multifaceted terminology | 6 |
| 2.2 Metropolitan regions as objects of research for spatial planning and geography | 8 |
| 2.3 Research approach to this investigation | 9 |
| 3 Current framework conditions | 10 |
| 3.1 The global level: the effects of globalisation and international competition | 10 |
| 3.2 The European level: the Lisbon and Göteborg strategies and polycentric development | 10 |
| 3.3 The Federal Republic of Germany: reorientation of spatial development policy | 11 |
| 3.4 The neighbouring countries of France and Switzerland | 12 |
| 4 Metropolitan regions as a new spatial planning concept | 13 |
| 4.1 Metropolitan regions within the European Union | 13 |
| 4.2 The European metropolitan regions within the Federal Republic of Germany | 15 |
| 4.2.1 Functions of the metropolitan regions | 16 |
| 4.2.2 Developments since the turn of the millennium | 17 |
| 4.2.3 Future development of the concept | 19 |
| 4.3 Metropolitan regions in France and Switzerland | 21 |
| 4.4 Eurodistricts and European catchment areas as transnational approaches | 23 |
| 5 Issues of implementation in planning practice | 24 |
| 5.1 Re-orientation or paradigm shift in spatial planning? | 24 |
| 5.2 Flexible geometries versus strict territorial delimitations | 25 |
| 5.3 Large-scale communities of responsibility or marginalisation of rural areas? | 28 |
| 5.3.1 Metropolitan regions as growth engines and the backbone of the Lisbon strategy | 28 |
| 5.3.2 Growth regions outside metropolitan regions | 29 |
| 5.3.3 A new orientation of spatial planning policy and its consequences for rural areas | 30 |
| | V |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 5.3.4 | Large-scale communities of responsibility and spill-over effects | 32 |
| 5.4 | Changes in the subsidy structure | 34 |
| 5.5 | Metropolitan/regional governance – new management forms and new planning culture | 36 |
| 5.5.1 | Institutional restructuring | 37 |

Part II Implementation in south-western Germany 39

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 6 | The European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (EMRS) | 42 |
| 6.1 | The current situation in the metropolitan region | 42 |
| 6.2 | New orientation of regional planning – the Verband Region Stuttgart (VRS) | 44 |
| 6.3 | Expectations for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 46 |
| 6.4 | The discussion process regarding the problem of delimitation | 48 |
| 6.4.1 | Expansion of the metropolitan region | 49 |
| 6.4.2 | Assessments by the municipalities | 52 |
| 6.4.3 | Flexible geometries and network structures | 55 |
| 6.5 | Planning culture and metropolitan governance | 56 |
| 6.5.1 | Expansion of the spectrum of actors | 58 |
| 6.5.2 | The creation of new structures | 60 |
| 6.5.3 | Assessment of management options by the municipalities | 62 |
| 6.6 | Implementation strategies: lighthouse projects and guiding principles | 63 |
| 6.6.1 | Regional development concept including the development of guiding principles | 65 |
| 6.6.2 | Lighthouse projects within the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 65 |
| 6.7 | Financing problems experienced by the Metropolitan Region | 66 |
| 6.8 | Internal and external integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 68 |
| 6.8.1 | External integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 68 |
| 6.8.2 | Internal integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 70 |
| 6.9 | Cooperation or competition between the EMRS and other regions | 73 |
| 6.10 | Summary and prognosis | 74 |
| 7 | The Rhine/Neckar European Metropolitan Region | 76 |
| 7.1 | Current situation in the urban agglomeration | 76 |
| 7.2 | The Rhine/Neckar European Metropolitan Region | 77 |
| 7.2.1 | Stages in the process of recognition as a European Metropolitan Region | 78 |
| 7.2.2 | Metropolitan functions and political will | 79 |
| 7.2.3 | Expectations for the Metropolitan Region | 80 |
| 7.2.4 | Organisational structure and spectrum of actors | 81 |
| 7.2.5 | Delimitation and regional awareness | 86 |
| 7.2.6 | Planning culture and metropolitan governance | 92 |
| 7.2.7 | Internal and external marketing | 93 |
| 7.2.8 | Strategies for implementation and financing | 94 |
| 7.3 | Summary and prognosis | 97 |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|-----|
| 8 | Areas outside accredited metropolitan regions | 99 |
| 8.1 | The potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region | 99 |
| 8.2 | The Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict | 103 |
| 8.2.1 | The current situation within the urban agglomeration area | 104 |
| 8.2.2 | The Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict | 105 |
| 8.2.3 | The French Metropolitan Region of Strasbourg/Ortenau | 107 |
| 8.2.4 | Metropolitan projects | 108 |
| 8.2.5 | Special challenges for the transnational metropolitan region | 109 |
| 8.3 | The metropolitan regions of Northern Switzerland and their spatial catchment areas | 110 |
| 8.4 | Growth regions outside the metropolitan regions | 112 |
| 8.4.1 | The Lake Constance region | 113 |
| 8.4.2 | Other growth regions outside accredited metropolitan regions | 115 |
| 8.5 | "Peripheral regions" in south-western Germany? | 116 |
| 8.5.1 | Spill-over effects or the risk of marginalisation? | 116 |
| 8.6 | Assessments by the municipal and regional actors | 118 |
| 8.7 | Summary and prognosis | 126 |
| 9 | Comparing the metropolitan regions in south-western Germany | 127 |
| 9.1 | Heterogeneous territories and the influence of spatial categories and regions on assessments | 127 |
| 9.2 | Summary and conclusions about current implementation in south-western Germany | 135 |
| Part III | Perspectives of implementation in south-western Germany: Opportunities, obstacles and future challenges | 137 |
| 10.1 | Spatial interconnections, spatial polarisation and peripheralisation | 137 |
| 10.2 | Metropolitan governance and network structures | 138 |
| 10.3 | Over-extension trends and marginalisation fears | 140 |
| 10.4 | Lack of an overall strategy for Baden-Württemberg | 141 |
| 10.5 | Specific concepts for transnational catchment areas | 142 |
| 10.6 | Perspectives of implementation – conclusions drawn on the basis of the research questions | 142 |
| Bibliography | | 145 |
| Appendix | | 163 |
| | Letter to mayors (example: Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region) | 164 |
| | Questionnaire for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 165 |
| | Questionnaire for the Regional Assembly of the Stuttgart Regional Association | 170 |
| | Questionnaire for the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region | 174 |
| | Questionnaire for central places outside the accredited metropolitan regions | 178 |
| | Questionnaire for the Strasbourg-Ortenau Eurodistrict | 182 |

| List of figures, maps and tables | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Figure 1: Assessment of expected advantages and general expectations of the municipalities | 47 |
| Figure 2: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept by the regional assembly and the municipalities | 47 |
| Figure 3: Degree of acceptance for a network structure and endorsement of a clear territorial delimitation | 52 |
| Figure 4: Sense of belonging and preferred delimitation | 54 |
| Figure 5: Possible restriction of municipal planning authority and preferred strategies of implementation | 63 |
| Figure 6: Assessment of previous spatial planning concepts, and assessment of the need for action by the regional assembly | 64 |
| Figure 7: Possible reduction in subsidies outside the metropolitan regions and financing models | 67 |
| Figure 8: General support of the growth engines and assessment of the spill-over effects | 68 |
| Figure 9: Comprehensibility and transparency of the metropolitan regional concept and level of information | 71 |
| Figure 10: Desire for increased integration in the implementation process and questioning of the equality postulate by the metropolitan regional concept | 72 |
| Figure 11: General expectations of the municipalities and assessment of various aspects of the metropolitan regional concept | 81 |
| Figure 12: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept and organigram of the metropolitan region | 81 |
| Figure 13: Satisfaction with the chosen organisational structure and desire for the integration of more actors | 84 |
| Figure 14: Endorsement of clear territorial delimitation and evaluation of a possible network structure | 87 |
| Figure 15: Possible integration of further areas as well as lack of understanding for existing integration of sub-regions | 89 |
| Figure 16: Three federal states – opportunity or obstacle, as well as possible restriction of planning authority | 91 |
| Figure 17: Assessment of the spill-over effects and support of growth engines | 92 |
| Figure 18: Comprehensibility and transparency of the concept and level of information | 94 |
| Figure 19: Preferred implementation strategies and assessment of the suitability of previous spatial planning concepts | 95 |
| Figure 20: Financing options and a possible reduction in subsidies outside the metropolitan regions | 97 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 21: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept and the concept of the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict | 119 |
| Figure 22: Comprehensibility and transparency of the concept and level of information | 120 |
| Figure 23: Central places: assessment of a possible paradigm shift, and spill-over effects | 122 |
| Figure 24: General support of growth engines and possible restriction of planning authority | 123 |
| Figure 25: Endorsement of a clear territorial delimitation and the option of a network structure | 124 |
| Figure 26: Assessment of a clear territorial delimitation and the option of a network structure | 129 |
| Figure 27: Assessment of the spill-over effects and endorsement of the general support of growth engines | 131 |
| Figure 28: Preferred implementation strategies and assessment of the suitability of previous spatial planning concepts | 132 |
| Figure 29: General assessment of the restriction of municipal planning authority and the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept | 133 |
| Figure 30: Comprehensibility and level of information in Baden-Württemberg | 134 |

List of maps

| | |
|--|-----|
| Map 1: The current metropolitan regions in the Federal Republic of Germany | 20 |
| Map 2: Current situation of metropolitan regions in Baden-Württemberg | 40 |
| Map 3: EMRS and the extension of its borders | 49 |
| Map 4: The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region | 76 |
| Map 5: The potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region | 100 |
| Map 6: Rural areas and metropolitan regions in south-western Germany | 128 |

List of tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1: List of experts consulted | 4 |
| Table 2: Empirical research - standardised surveys and response rates | 5 |
| Table 3: Categorisation of the urban agglomerations of Stuttgart, Mannheim and Strasbourg in various studies | 41 |
| Table 4: Municipalities and spatial categories according to the 2002 State Development Plan | 51 |
| Table 5: Strategies of the VRS for the external integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 69 |
| Table 6: Spatial categories within and outside the accredited metropolitan regions | 129 |

List of photographs

Photo 1: A sign on the side of the B 27 at the border between the Stuttgart
Regional Association and the Neckar/Alb Regional Association Title I

List of abbreviations for the figures and other abbreviations

In order to save space, abbreviations have been used in the figures. The corresponding explanations may be found in the following list:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Adj. reg. assoc. | Regional associations adjoining the Stuttgart region, i. e. Neckar/Alb, Heilbronn/Franken, East Württemberg and Northern Black Forest |
| Aggl. area | Agglomeration area and fringes |
| Ba-Wü | Baden-Württemberg |
| EMRS | European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart |
| EU | European Union |
| Ger | Federal Republic of Germany |
| HC | Higher order centre |
| Large municip. | Municipalities with at least 10 000 residents |
| LC | Lower order centre |
| MKRO | Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning |
| MR | Metropolitan region |
| MR 2002 | Stuttgart Metropolitan Region according to the State Development Plan 2002 |
| MR 2007 | New municipalities added after expansion of the Stuttgart Metropolitan Region |
| n. s. | Not specified |
| RA VRS | Regional Assembly of the Stuttgart Regional Association |
| RC | Major regional centre |
| Redistrib. finance | Redistribution finance |
| Rh-Pfalz | Rhineland Palatinate |
| Rural areas | Rural land in the narrow sense of the word and built-up areas in rural regions |
| SC | Small centre |
| SDP | State Development Plan (here: the current 2002 version for Baden-Württemberg) |
| Small municip. | Municipalities with a maximum of 9 999 residents |
| VRS | Stuttgart Regional Association |

Preface

For many years now, the approach adopted with great success at the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL) towards particularly complex areas of research has involved working in research alliances. This approach allows for more intensive thematic co-ordination and networking among the various bodies involved. It also makes it possible to exploit any synergies with greater consistency.

The ARL's medium-term research alliances are principally dedicated to issues with a cross-cutting character. Over recent years and decades, the focus of research has been placed in particular on the ecological orientation of spatial planning, land-resource policy, sustainable spatial development, and, not least, demographic changes and their impacts for spatial structure. Many of these cross-cutting issues will in the future remain a key focus of ARL activities. However, a number of other complex questions now appear in the Academy's more recent research programmes: creating parity of living conditions; European spatial development; the development of peripheral and structurally weak, rural areas; the development of conurbations and metropolitan regions.

With the weakening of macroeconomic growth, and equally as an effect of the insights coming from New Economic Geography and from New Growth Theory, the role of conurbations and metropolitan regions has once again come under the spotlight of spatial research. On the one hand, this is motivated by the fundamental shift which is taking place with regard to Germany's system of towns and cities. At the same time, however, it is important to establish the extent to which the impulses for macroeconomic growth actually do emanate from the major metropolitan areas, and whether there is a good case for providing greater support to these areas through a policy of actively promoting their economic development. Here it is in particular the paradigm of ensuring parity of living conditions throughout the national territory which is called into question. As well as re-examining the theoretical basis for this principle, it is important to gauge the performance of conurbations and metropolitan regions, both empirically and comparatively, in order to identify just what factors account for the success of any one specific metropolitan region vis-à-vis the others it is in competition with; equally, it is necessary to clarify just what functions should in future be assigned to the other elements in the system of towns and cities. Once this has been established, the focus can shift, for example, to determining precisely which instruments of active spatial-development policy are most suited to promoting metropolitan regions.

This has been the topic area focused on at the ARL by the joint working group of Difu, ILS, IRS and ARL on "Metropolitan regions – innovation, competition, capabilities", led by Professor Dr.-Ing. Jörg Knieling of the HafenCity University, Hamburg, which reported in mid-2009. A number of the ARL's regional working groups (the LAGs) have also addressed the topic of metropolitan regions and also presented research findings in this field. Further studies will be forthcoming.

As in the case of the "Spatial consequences of demographic change", another cross-cutting topic, the ARL steering committee has once again decided to publish all of the research findings relating to metropolitan regions under the single thematic umbrella of "Metropolitan regions and spatial development". Secondary titles will be used to identify the specific sub-topic addressed. Every volume will also list the other contributions to the series previously published.

Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL)

Introduction

This project examines the implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice and traces the resulting opportunities, obstacles and challenges. Extensive empirical investigation and analysis provides the basis of discussion. Baden-Württemberg proved to be a highly interesting research area, due to the multiple faceted implementation strategies that may be observed here.

Although at the beginning of the data collection period it was intended to limit the research area to the original borders of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (see Chapter 6.3 in this regard), it emerged during the course of the project that such a restriction would not result in adequate consideration of this complex theme. The focus of investigation is still the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, where – owing to the integration of the university city of Tübingen – intensive, participatory observation of the implementation process was possible. The accreditation of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region in 2005 made clear, however, that consideration of the theme through the whole of the state of Baden-Württemberg (and in some cases even beyond) was necessary. The intensity and extent of empirical investigation carried out in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart was not, however, fully maintained in the other regions.

Similarly, the comparison of implementation strategies in Germany and France could not be carried through in quite the form originally intended, as the survey response rate was too low among the French municipalities. However, consideration of the cross-border catchment areas has resulted in aspects of current French and Swiss spatial development policies being incorporated into this study.

The investigation concentrates primarily on issues concerning the concrete design and implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice. Aspects of metropolitan governance, spatial interconnections and polarisation are thus considered, as well as the practical planning approach to variable geometries and large-scale communities of responsibility. A particular focus is on the expectations and fears of municipal and regional actors, obstacles to the implementation process, and the space-time dynamics of implementation.

The study is divided into a theoretical section, which includes current research approaches; an empirical section, which includes the results and analysis of the extensive surveys; and a practically-orientated section, which discusses the concrete consequences of and perspectives for the implementation of the new concept. Many new research directions are indicated by the investigation, particularly in terms of specification and further development of the concept.

The submission of a piece of work that was based largely on empirical investigation would have been impossible without the considerable support of numerous people. At this point the author would therefore like to thank all the experts who gave up considerable amounts of their valuable time for discussions, as well as all municipal and regional actors who took the time to complete the questionnaire.

A special thank-you goes to Professor Dieter Eberle for his supervision of my work, as well as to my colleagues Lutz-Michael Vollmer, Walburg Speidel, Johannes Fritz, Daniel Disterheft, Stefanie Hertfelder, Mirjam Garlin and Lorenz Mikosch for their considerable support during data research, data processing and last – but not least – the representation of these data. A special thank-you also goes to Dr. Katharine Thomas for her great linguistic polishing skills.

I would also like to thank my parents and my brother for their careful and diligent reading of my work with regard to spelling and coherence, and my daughter Lena-Sophie for her support, patience and understanding for this extensive research project, although there were many times when it clashed with her justifiable expectations of her mother.

The editorial deadline for this work was July 2008

Dr. Heidi Elisabeth Megerle

Tübingen, 12th may 2009

I Methodological, theoretical and conceptual basis

Chapter I outlines the methods, theories and concepts that form the basis of this research into the implementation of the metropolitan region concept in south-western Germany. The empirical findings are thus set within the current research context.

1 Methodological basis

This project investigates the way in which the metropolitan region concept has been applied in south-western Germany. Extensive empirical research focused on the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. As the state of Baden-Württemberg shares borders with both France and Switzerland, aspects of current French and Swiss spatial development policies are also pertinent, particularly with regard to the potential trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region, the German-French Eurodistrict of Strasbourg/Ortenau – which has the status of a French metropolitan region – and the European catchment area of Lake Constance. However, no collection of empirical data took place in either France or Switzerland.

Due to the very different implementations of the concept in the Stuttgart and the Rhine/Neckar metropolitan regions, it was decided to structure the respective chapters differently so as to suit the relevant particulars.

1.1 Data sources and methodological approach

An academic assessment of the ways in which the spatial concept of metropolitan regions is implemented in planning practice requires consideration of the various data sources and methodological approaches.

Although a great deal has been published regarding general research into metropolises and spatial development, publications on metropolitan regions in south-western Germany and empirical research into the implementation of the concept in planning practice are comparatively rare. The use of statistical data is limited by the lack of correspondence between the boundaries of the various administrative and functional territories (Paal 2005: 13). Even after considering grey literature (on-line newsletters; minutes of meetings, etc.), it was clear that original empirical research was necessary. This consisted firstly of comprehensive surveys conducted among the various groups of actors. These surveys differentiated between interviews with experts and standardised questionnaires sent to municipal and regional actors.

Subject-specific guided interviews with experts were conducted by the author in sessions lasting between one and several hours. The interviewees selected were representatives from both municipal and regional level, as well as academic representatives (Table 1). In addition, material gathered from conference lectures and discussions was also used.

Table 1: List of experts consulted

| Experts consulted | Institution | Date |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Aring, Jürgen, Prof. Dr. | Chair for City and Regional Planning, University of Kassel | 28/06/07 |
| Dallinger, Stefan | Director of the Rhine/Neckar Association | 17/11/06 |
| Eberle, Gabi | Head of the Tübingen Citizens' and Transport Association | 11/04/06 |
| Eble, Thomas | Director of the East Württemberg Regional Association | 06/06/08 |
| Edelmann, Dieter | Mayor of the Schlaitdorf Municipality | 24/11/06 |
| Ewald, Markus | Mayor of the City of Bad Urach | 12/01/07 |
| Gust, Dieter, Prof. Dr. | Director of the Neckar/Alb Regional Association | 03/07/07 25/04/06 |
| Hein, Ekkehard | Director of the Heilbronn/Franken Regional Association | 11/06/07 |
| Köhler, Stefan | Director of the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia Regional Association | 17/10/07 |
| Kühne, Olaf, Prof. Dr. | Ministry for the Environment of the Saarland | 15/07/07 |
| Ludwig, Jürgen, Dr. | Stuttgart Regional Association | 14/07/06 |
| Mungenast, Klaus | Mayor of the Municipality of Kappelrodeck | 12/06/07 |
| Riethe, Markus | Deputy Director of the East Württemberg Regional Association | 06/06/08 |
| Rogg, Walter, Dr. | Executive Director of the Stuttgart Regional Economic Development Association | 16/05/07 |
| Russ-Scherer, Brigitte | Lord Mayor of the City of Tübingen | 20/12/06 |
| Samain, Martin | Donau/Iller Regional Association | 29/06/07 |
| Scheffold, Heiner | Ministry for the Rural Areas of Baden-Württemberg | 11/07/07 |
| Schlossnikel, Reinhold, Dr. | Staff function in the Lord Mayor's Office of the City of Stuttgart | 30/06/06 |
| Schmid, Ralf | Stuttgart Regional Forum | 14/07/06 |
| Schuler, Bernhard | Lord Mayor of the City of Leonberg | 12/08/06 |
| Schulze, Ulrich | Ministry of the Economy for Baden-Württemberg | 12/05/06 |
| Sinz, Manfred | Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, Berlin | 25/10/07 |
| Steinacher, Bernd, Dr. | Stuttgart Regional Association | 12/06/08 |

Relevant to the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, two current works by M. König (2007) and W. König (2007) were available; each of these authors had conducted extensive interviews with key persons in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region. Both these works quoted and referenced the interview partners verbatim and thus provided the relevant quotations used in this document. It was thought superfluous to conduct similar surveys at a similar point in time.

The standardised surveys were addressed to all the mayors of independent municipalities in the metropolitan regions of Stuttgart, Rhine/Neckar and the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict, as well as to municipalities with central place functions in the remainder of Baden-Württemberg. As far as possible, the personal email addresses of the mayors were used for this contact. The various questionnaires (see Appendix) were attached to the emails. No information beyond the covering letter (see Appendix) was provided. Eleven of the 12 regional associations of Baden-Württemberg were also included in the surveys. This either took place by means of an expert interview or of a questionnaire.

Table 2: Empirical research: standardised surveys and response rates

| Regional area | Number of letters | Total responses | Fully completed questionnaires | Response rate | Survey dates (second batch of questionnaires) |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart | 450 | 151 | 114 | 33 % | July 2006 (Nov 2006) May 2007 ¹ (July 2007) |
| Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region | 229 | 63 | 55 | 28 % | Nov 2006 (Jan 2007) |
| Strasbourg-Ortenau Eurodistrict | 51 (139) | 14 (2) | 10 (2) | 27 % (1.5 %) | May 2007 (Nov 2007) (French municipalities) |
| Central places outside the regions mentioned above | 103 | 71 | 57 | 69 % | July 2007 (Oct 2007) |
| Regional Assembly of Stuttgart Regional Association | 93 | 29 | 25 | 31 % | April 2008 |

As the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart was expanded during the survey period, municipalities within the regional associations of Heilbronn/Franken and East Württemberg, which had not been included in the first survey wave, were emailed somewhat later. Due to the early survey period in Stuttgart and the considerable developments observed since, a further standardised survey was conducted among representatives of the Regional Assembly of the Stuttgart Regional Association in spring 2008. This was also carried out by email with the questionnaire attached, but there was no second reminder to non-respondents due to the imminent publishing deadline.

Overall, the response rates were gratifyingly high and can thus be regarded as statistically significant. The difference between the total response rate and the number of fully completed questionnaires is only partially due to the basic refusal rate (lack of time, lack of interest, etc.); it also reflects a number of individualised responses, some of which were very enlightening and were thus separately evaluated.

As expected, not all municipalities fully answered all questions. The total population used in the graphical representations thus varies both within one metropolitan region and in the comparative views. In addition to the standardised Excel evaluation of the questionnaires, the at times extensive comments added to the questionnaires or included in accompanying letters were evaluated. Particularly enlightening comments are directly quoted in the footnotes. In a few cases, the municipalities and persons concerned requested anonymity.

¹ Additional dispatch to the expanded regional area, i.e. to a total of 106 additional municipalities within the regional associations of Heilbronn/Franken and East Württemberg.

2 Theoretical and conceptual basis

By way of introduction, relevant terminology is defined and the current state of research discussed.

2.1 Metropolis and metropolitan region: multifaceted terminology

Due to far-reaching changes in global conditions (Chapter 3), the use of terms such as "metropolis", "world city", "global city", etc. has become increasingly common, both in professional circles and in the popular science media.

Even in geography, however, definition and critical discussion of the term "metropolis" has been long avoided (Paal 2005: 18).² This is exacerbated by the large variety of sometimes undefined alternative terms, including "world city", "global city", "cosmopolis", etc. (Heineberg 2006: 29; Gerhard 2004: 5). To date, there is no consistent understanding of the terminology (Blotevogel 2005: 644).

The demographic tradition of urban research uses urban population figures and densities. However, pure quantitative classifications based on population concentrations rarely do justice to the functional significance of a metropolis. Functionally determined definitions have thus become increasingly prevalent internationally, so that there is no longer a direct connection between the significance of a metropolis and its number of inhabitants (Paal 2005: 23). One of the first approaches of this sort was the world city hypotheses of Friedmann (1986), in which the metropolises are portrayed as spatial anchor points in international economic networks. Based on seven indicators,³ some of which are comparable to those of the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung: BBR) (Chapter 4.2.1), he divides the cities of the western hemisphere into "primary and secondary cities". No German cities are included. Sassen's (1996: 39) functional definition of "global cities" focuses even more closely on their economic role as central locations for highly developed services and telecommunication facilities. The Globalization and World Cities Study Group has developed a research approach that concentrated on high-value global services (advanced producer services) and their transnational organisational networks as indicators for the functional relations between cities (Hoyler 2005a: 229). In addition to the strong focus on economic aspects, there has been an increasing integration of political and social aspects since the mid-1990s. This has resulted in varying city hierarchies, as world cities that lead economically do not always house the leading political institutions (Knox 1995: 238).

The term metropolis (and also global city, etc) refers primarily to rather monocentric urban structures, although this is not always explicitly stated. In particular, polycentric urban agglomerations such as the Ruhr, can thus not be termed metropolises despite their large populations. Even rather monocentric structures are frequently characterised by the administratively delimited urban area being surrounded by a number of sub-centres of varying size (Heineberg 2006: 29) or are administratively fragmented for historical reasons. As the spatiality underlying the term metropolis is frequently unclear (Adam, Göttsche-Stellmann 2002: 513), such urban structures or polycentric urban agglomeration regions are increasingly being defined by terms that emphasise their regionality. Examples are "global city region" (Scott 2001), "metropolitan area" (Heine-

² A very detailed discussion of the term metropolis may be found in Paal (2005: 18 ff.), and of the terms world city and metropolis in Blotevogel (1998: 35 f.).

³ "Important financial centres, head offices of transnational organisations; a growing service sector; production centres, important transport nodes, population size" (quoted from Adam et al 2005: 419).

berg 2006: 29), as well as "metropolitan region" (Blotevogel (1998: 39), used to refer to the functional agglomeration formed by a metropolis and its surroundings when metropolitan infrastructure such as airports, etc. are located in the latter. In extreme cases, a "metropolitan region" may develop in polycentric regions which lack an obvious metropolis.

In regional and urban planning circles, terms for the increasing interconnections between the core city and its surroundings or between polycentric urban structures are being coined. When the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities compiled by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning was approved in 1995, it was the first time that spatial and functional locations whose prominent functions stretch across national borders were termed "European metropolitan regions" (MKRO 1995: 27). In contrast with the definitions discussed above, the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities makes no mention of criteria such as population thresholds or monocentric structures – the categorisation is based on purely functional criteria (Chapter 4.2.1) and on orientation characteristics. Comparable concepts were used in the European Spatial Development Perspective (Chapter 3.2) in 1999. The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning and the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (BBR and BMVBS 2006: 58) use the definition given in the Framework as a starting point but stipulate that metropolitan regions are generally high-density conurbations with at least a million residents. In addition it is stated that a metropolitan region is distinguished by cooperation and good networking between the core and the inner catchment area. The Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 3) distinguish between four dimensions:

- In analytical terms, metropolitan regions are defined as clusters of metropolitan facilities.
- In terms of actors and activities, metropolitan regions are a space for interaction between key regional actors about joint regional goals, strategies and projects, as well as necessary forms of organisation.
- In terms of spatial development, metropolitan regions are a normative key concept intended to contribute towards furthering innovation and economic growth.
- In terms of the symbolic dimension of urban and regional development metropolitan regions are carriers of symbols associated with global cities and urban life.

Köppen (2006: 289) calls for a differentiated definition or methodology that would cover the specific problem of polycentric metropolitan regions. However, Aring (2005: 28) believes that spatial planning should focus on strengthening the position of the metropolitan regions rather than wasting time on formal definition criteria. In his view, the essential goal is to promote overall economic development by following the metropolitan region approach. Feil (2005: 6) has similar views, regarding the lack of clear terminology as being of secondary importance; he sees the term metropolitan region as describing cooperation between the metropolitan core and its surroundings. Aring (2007a) believes that metropolitan region is an appropriate term for the new, growth-orientated spatial concept as it conveys "charm and charisma" and can motivate relevant actors. However, the term metropolitan region with or without the addition of "European" can be confusing. Aring (2008: 5) laments the "clear divide between the everyday definition of a metropolis" and the use of the term in a spatial planning context. In the latter context, the term refers to the metropolitan area (in the sense of an urban region) rather than to a metropolis (in the sense of a global city). Aring (2008: 5) also does not see any

overlap with the term "metropolitan area", as the normative term "metropolitan region" is "more of a network than a territory".

The addition of "European" was introduced against the background of European integration and spatial development. In the meantime, however, the more common term "metropolitan region" has become the norm, as the European reference is not in itself decisive (Blotevogel 2005c: 642). It also leads some observers to believe that the concept of metropolitan regions was a European Union concept.⁴ Adam and Göttsche-Stellmann (2002: 524) therefore call for further development of spatial science typologies as well as an "analytical flanking of the term European Metropolitan Region", the use of which in Germany tends to be normative rather than analytical.

While metropolitan regions are generally classified as engines of economic development throughout Europe, there is no clear European definition of the term, thus rendering international comparisons difficult (BAK 2006: 7).

2.2 Metropolitan regions as objects of research for spatial planning and geography

Paal (2005: 11) confirms that research into metropolises is in a "boom" phase, both in a global and in a European context. One focus is found in urban geography, for instance in the various approaches taken to compiling city hierarchies which include empirical data. The spatial planning aspect of the concept of metropolitan regions is also increasingly a focus of research, research which Adam et al (2005: 430) describe as being "highly politically relevant".

An important aspect of such research is the drawing up of strategies intended to increase the competitiveness of metropolises. Equally important is the clarification of the conditions and/or procedures that result in different levels of competitive ability and differing development of metropolitan functions (see Paal 2005, Krätke 2007 and Kujath 2005 in this regard). In addition, Beier and Matern (2007: 82) draw attention to aspects of European spatial development, particularly to the effects of strategic metropolitan networks and to aspects of cross-border cooperation such as differing planning cultures and institutional frameworks. Kujath (2005: 56) discusses the new role of the metropolitan regions in the service industry and knowledge economy and sees a related need for research into the changing nature of locational advantages resulting from the "industrialisation of information production". There have thus far been few studies on the organisation of the intraregional and interregional networking of metropolitan economies (Kujath 2005a: 12).

In addition, it emerged during the course of this study that further focuses for research are provided by the changing spatiotemporal patterns of the metropolitan regions, as well as the developing governance structures and associated problems and challenges. Beier and Matern (2007: 82 f.) regard as relevant investigations into the perhaps exceptional quality of metropolitan governance as opposed to regional governance, as well as the optimal design of management structures. Köppen (2006: 294) requests general clarification as to how the regions are to be institutionally and financially enabled to meet future challenges, as well as about the extent to which the "typically German" polycentrically structured urban agglomerations are in any position to "form functional metropolitan regions".

⁴ For example, Sonnleitner (2007: 44) cites: "The European approach to metropolitan regions simply does not go with the German federal spatial structure. This can be seen at a glance when looking at the map that insists that Erfurt, Bremen and other cities are all "metropolises".

Other research questions have arisen concerning the spatial effects of the knowledge economy, which are clearly different from the earlier spatial patterns of urbanisation or suburbanisation. Kujath (2005a: 14) assumes that the various forms of metropolisation overlap throughout the entire region, but is sceptical about uniform patterns being in any way detectable. Thus far there has also been very little empirical proof of spill-over effects or of metropolitan regions acting as engines of growth (Chapter 5.3.4). Thus Halbert (2005: 296) sees a need for further research with regard to the effects of the development of metropolitan regions on nearby small- and medium-sized towns, while Grabski-Kieron (2007: 41) regards the mechanisms and functions of the large-scale communities of responsibility concerned to be worthy of further research.

There are also research gaps with regard to cross-border metropolitan regions and their specific transnational approaches (e.g. the trinational Upper Rhine Region), as well as with regard to international comparison of the various approaches and strategies framed by the differing national planning systems and cultures.

2.3 Research approach to this investigation

This project focuses on the concrete implementation of the concept of metropolitan regions in planning practice. The following research questions and gaps are of particular concern:

- Which spatiotemporal changes, obstacles and problems can be observed in the course of the implementation process?
- What are the expectations and fears of the various groups of actors with regard to implementation? Here the particular focus is on rural areas.
- How are the concrete effects of the so-called large-scale communities of responsibility assessed and what are the specific reactions to them?
- Does implementation lead to increasing spatial polarisation between the metropolitan regions and peripheral areas?
- How are new planning approaches such as variable geometries and non-institutionalised regional governance used and how is their efficiency assessed?
- Do planning theorists and practitioners differ in their assessments and approaches and, if so, how?
- How well known is the concept of metropolitan regions among the mayors and how comprehensible and transparent do they find this concept?
- Do the dynamics of the implementation process differ within south-western Germany? If so, what are the underlying reasons for this?
- Which specific challenges are posed by cross-border implementation?

This comprehensive empirical investigation aims to provide answers to these still open research questions. Planning theory and practice are compared and contrasted using concrete examples, allowing the conclusions found in Chapter III to be drawn.

3 Current framework conditions

The spatial concept of metropolitan regions must be seen against the background of recent significant changes in framework conditions at all scales ranging from global to local. It should be noted that these changing conditions are not the result of spatial development strategies, rather spatial development policies are called upon to react to these changing realities with appropriate concepts.

3.1 The global level: the effects of globalisation and international competition

With increasing dissolution of market boundaries, liberalisation and deregulation, globalisation has resulted in a new spatial economy that supersedes the regulatory authority of the national states. Connected to this is a major trend of spatial development: the increasing metropolisation of management and control functions, economic development and innovation potential. Well-developed economic areas are the primary bearers of these developments and the main nodal points for large-scale economic relationship networks (Krätke 2007: 2). Competition for investment and jobs is increasing between different locations and regions and clearly extends beyond the national scale. Global cities (Sassen 1991), where economic management and control functions are significantly concentrated, are increasingly breaking away from their territorial and national contexts and are moving towards the top of the global urban system. This economic globalisation has resulted in a new geography of centralisation and marginalisation (Sassen 1996: 162). Castells (2004) has noted a trend towards a spatial logic, i.e. a "space of flows" with specific places as spatially localised nodes of the network. In addition, there is a "regional renaissance" which is closely related to globalisation effects, because under conditions of global competition the regional scale becomes more relevant than that of individual cities (Blotevogel 1998: 32).

Of crucial importance is increasing international competition, which requires cities and regions to position themselves internationally, supplemented by interregional competition within Germany. In this locational competition individual places or administratively delimited areas are of increasingly less importance than large-scale economic regions (metropolitan regions) (Stiens 2003: 10).

3.2 The European level: the Lisbon and Göteborg strategies and polycentric development

Current regional developments within the European Union are characterised by integration into the global economy (globalisation), by increasing integration within the union (Europeanisation) and by a concentration of growth and management functions within the urban agglomerations (metropolisation). The European Union is increasingly developing into a "political, institutional and economically networked transnational economic area" (Krätke 2007: VI ff.). These developments result in EU involvement in worldwide locational competition. Economic prosperity, social cohesion and international cultural transfer are all directly linked to a system of competitive metropolitan regions which are sites of knowledge-based growth and innovation (Kujath 2005a: 9). Economically strong urban agglomerations are thus the bearers of these developments and are increasingly the focus of spatial development policies.

As early as 1999 the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) made provision for strengthening and extending the strategic role of a polycentric and balanced system of metropolitan regions, as well as for several global integration zones. Also noteworthy is the notion of a "large-scale division of functions" between the metropoli-

tan and rural regions in the sense of a balance of interests, overcoming "rural and urban dualism, which is today no longer appropriate" (European Commission 1999: 20).

The Lisbon strategy, approved in 2000, aimed to turn the European Union into the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economic region by 2010. With this in mind, economic policy is to concentrate on boosting the potential for economic growth and on the transition to a knowledge-based economy. They may not be mentioned in the text, but nonetheless the metropolitan regions have a key role to play as the spatial basis on which the Lisbon strategy is to be realised (Krätke 2007: VI). One of the notable innovations is the fact that in future not only disadvantaged regions are to receive development aid but also regions with growth and innovation cores. Although the execution of this strategy is still in dispute, representatives of the rural regions fear that the focus of economic aid may shift (Chapters 5.3 and 5.4).

The Göteborg strategy was approved in 2001 and supplements the Lisbon strategy by adding aspects of sustainable development. Its objectives are regarded as being of equal political value for European Union spatial development policies (Schön, Selke 2007: 438). Blotevogel (2007: 24) therefore demands a re-evaluation of the role of metropolitan regions in the sense of a socially and economically sustainable "Lisbon/Göteborg strategy" and not in the sense of an "unconditional focus on spatialised Lisbon goals". The Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany (Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen: IKM) also emphasises the potential of the metropolitan regions to contribute not only to employment strategy and global competitiveness but also to the goal of sustainable development (2004a).

The Territorial Agenda approved in May 2007 serves as an action-orientated political framework for future cooperation within the European Union. It only addresses metropolitan regions relatively indirectly, however, by recommending that cities and regions should be firmly integrated into the execution of the Lisbon strategy. Within the framework of urban-rural partnerships, urban and rural regions are to cooperate using new forms of "territorial governance" (European Union 2007: 4), which is to involve the "promotion of horizontal and vertical political coherence" (BMVBS 2007:7). Originally the Territorial Agenda included a form of metropolitan region concept, but this was left out of the final version. According to Sinz (2007), this was due to fears on the part of the new eastern German states that it could lead to a redistribution of funds from the poor to the rich.

3.3 The Federal Republic of Germany: reorientation of spatial development policy

For decades, spatial planning attempted to create equal living conditions in all areas by supporting regions with development deficits and problems. At the beginning of the 1990s the effects of German reunification, globalisation, Europeanisation and metropolisation led to a considerable increase in spatial disparities (including polarisation processes in the east, with the creation of areas of shrinkage and stagnation) and alarmingly low levels of growth. A reorientation of spatial development policies with the development of new and innovative concepts became essential. The metropolitan regions were increasingly seen as engines of development and the focus shifted towards intervention at the scale of the region as it became clear that the situation called for regional cooperation rather than solutions undertaken by individual municipal authorities. Of crucial importance was the development of an understanding of planning as an integrative and project-orientated process, the role of which increasingly involves the coordination and moderation of complex spatial developments (MKRO 1995: 2).

Although the Federal Republic of Germany is not home to any of the alpha world cities (Chapter 3.1), there has nonetheless been a metropolisation of economic decision-making and control functions, of knowledge production and innovation, of nodal functions (gateways) and of cultural facilities and offerings (symbolic functions). Combined with this development is the formation of a "new city league" which, in Germany, includes almost a dozen of the major conurbations (Sinz 2006: 608). Frankfurt has the most pronounced metropolitan function of all the German cities, but does not belong in the top group of cities such as New York, London, Tokyo and Paris (Adam et al 2005: 421 ff.). Because of its historical development, Germany is extremely polycentric: eleven cities have high-ranking positions, a value only exceeded by the USA with 33 cities. Thus although Germany has no top-ranked centre, it – more than any other European country – has a closely-meshed network of high-ranking locations (Adam et al 2005: 424). Köppen (2006: 291) points out that according to the "current indicator sets used by the spatial sciences" Germany – with the exception of Frankfurt – has no "real, i. e. globally significant metropolises". In his view, therefore, the policy-planning discourse is all about "metropolitan regions without metropolises".

In response to the changed conditions and new challenges, spatial planning policy guidelines and a spatial planning policy framework were approved in the 1990s. The Federal Spatial Planning Act was amended at the end of 1997. This act explicitly makes provision for a joint drafting of guiding principles for spatial development by the German federation and the states, to be used as a tool to coordinate development expectations (Aring 2006: 613). The new "Guiding Principles and Strategies for Spatial Development in Germany" approved by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning on 30 June 2006 are to be seen in this context.

The guiding principles include the core themes of "growth and innovation", "securing the provision of public services", "conserving resources", and "developing cultural landscapes". New approaches include the strengthening of the development mandate, whereby rebalancing to ensure regional equity is increasingly occurring at the level of large-scale communities of responsibility. A new weighting has also been given to equity-oriented intervention, combined with necessary adaptations of the central places system. Another notable new approach is the embedding of spatial planning tasks in current economic and social problems instead of in individual spatial categories such as urban agglomerations or rural areas (Lutter 2006: 449 f.). The guidelines also synergise with specific departmental policies, the economy and civil society, and emphasise the common interests of the various actors (Aring, Sinz 2006: 452). In this way, they are intended to help set out spatial development policy as network policy, with close cooperation between the actors discussed (Sinz 2006: 614). The new concepts should thus be regarded as "signalising the modernisation of spatial planning in Germany" (Aring, Sinz 2006: 451). They provide a basis for the reanimation of spatial planning coordination, both within Germany and the European Union (Staats 2006: 695).

3.4 The neighbouring countries of France and Switzerland

With comparable framework conditions, France and Switzerland face similar challenges and thus similar spatial development trends and a parallel consideration of a reorientation of spatial policy.

Unlike the relatively balanced, polycentric urban system in Germany, the French urban system has some clear disparities. While Paris is a world city with a dominant primary position (Sassen 1996: 171; Auphan, Brücher 2005: 6), the city ranking of Cicille and Rozenblatt (2003) and the ESPON report (2005) still accord the other French con-

urbations an inferior position in international comparisons. In light of the dynamic transformation process experienced by other European cities, as well as increasing international competition between metropolitan regions, the French spatial planning authority – DATAR – considered a national strategy to strengthen the French urban system to be particularly important (Megerle 2008a: 39).

Although perceptions of Switzerland are still frequently dominated by a rural Alpine image, this image no longer accords with the current situation. Switzerland's position at the heart of the main area of European economic development (Pentagon) determines the country's development, especially that of its metropolitan regions, to a considerable extent. Continued urbanisation has now spread over 25% of the country, an area in which 75% of the population is now concentrated (ARE 2005: 11). Odermatt (2004: 648) even refers to the "ville Suisse", a band of urban development which stretches from Lake Constance to Lake Geneva. The large-scale unstructured urban areas that a lack of developmental coordination has allowed to materialise (ARE 2005: 13) are characterised by functional interactions that frequently cross the boundaries of the small Swiss administrative districts. This poses considerable challenges for management and administrative systems.

As economic activities, particularly those of the tertiary sector, become increasingly concentrated in metropolitan regions, peripheral areas are suffering population and job losses. The resulting imbalance has led to fears of marginalisation, particularly in those mountain regions that are not popular tourist destinations. Even the smaller and medium-sized urban settlements outside the metropolitan regions may become detached from current development processes: with their low economic and population potential they are ill equipped to cope with the current challenges on their own. The Federal Agency for Spatial Development (ARE 2005: 15) therefore questions the aim of creating a "balanced network of cities" as was suggested as recently as 1996 in the document "Features of Swiss Spatial Planning". Like its neighbours, Switzerland has thus responded with a reorientation of its spatial development policy (Chapter 4.3).

4 Metropolitan regions as a new spatial planning concept

Spatial planning policies at European and national level are increasingly focusing on economically strong metropolitan regions, due to the framework conditions described in Chapter 3.

4.1 Metropolitan regions within the European Union

In 1988, the initiative "Four Motors for Europe", which involved Baden-Württemberg, Rhône-Alpes, Catalonia and Lombardy, represented innovative regional development policy for economically strong metropolitan regions. This cooperation was catalysed by hopes of economic advantages, improvements in image and success in global competition (Fischer, Frech 2001: 10). Five years later, there was a paradigm shift with the aim of increasing the influence of the economically strong regions on political decision-making processes (Zimmermann-Steinhardt 2001: 48 ff.).

At almost the same time, a comparative study of the European urban system was published by Brunet (1989). It had been commissioned by DATAR and was targeted at French politicians and planners. Discussion focused on the one hand on the "risk of the marginalisation of Paris within the European economic framework" and the necessity of subsidising the capital, and, on the other hand, on decentralisation (Paal 2005: 48). The

study had a considerable impact. It is not only seen as "the starting point of a functional orientation in urban planning", but also attracted international attention by strikingly depicting the focus of European activity as a blue banana. A follow-up study (Cicille, Rozenblat 2003) is seen as one of the first "statistics-based rank-size rules for the European urban system", although the use of the NUTS-3 regional boundaries for the metropolitan regions was criticised (Paal 2005: 29). Both of these French studies had a considerable impact on the concept of metropolitan regions, as the comparison of the individual regions made their strengths and weaknesses in terms of global and European competition very clear. The new orientation of French spatial planning policy can be largely ascribed to the latter of these studies.

After the publication of the EUREK 1999 and the Lisbon Strategy 2000 (Chapter 3.2), the European Economic and Social Committee presented a statement concerning metropolitan regions in 2004, in which it established a direct association between the economically strong metropolitan regions and successful implementation of the Lisbon Strategy. One year later, the Commission of the European Communities (2005: 1 f.) documented the importance of cities as engines of growth and employment, gave highest priority to the agenda for growth and employment as part of the EU cohesion policy and demanded the removal of obstacles to growth. Similar statements were made in a 2006 paper by the Editorial Group concerning the strengthening of territorial cohesion as well as by the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (BMVBS 2007: 62).

In 2005, the report "Potentials for polycentric development in Europe" (ESPON 2005) was published. The economically strongest FUAs (Functional Urban Areas)⁵ identified here are the building blocks of the desired "global integration zones" and are classified as MEGAs (Metropolitan European Growth Areas). 76 of the 1595 FUAs were categorised as MEGAs (Antikainen 2005: 454), and then classified into five categories according to an indicator system that takes population, gross national product, headquarter and gateway functions, education level and R&D activities into account. Due to problems with the reference base for the data, the MEGAs were delimited in the same way as the NUTS-2 territorial units, which in Baden-Württemberg are equivalent to the administrative districts.⁶ The Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (BMVBS 2007: 66) sees the possibility of using the ESPON report for international benchmarking, while Adam and Göttsche-Stellmann (2005) see the need for an adaptation to a generally accepted basic framework for the urban system to facilitate international comparison and to make information usable for spatial planning policy.⁷

An international comparison (Germany, France, Netherlands, and Switzerland) showed that metropolitan regions in all countries are seen as strategic tools for economic and regional development. Among experts surveyed, 58% saw a further increase in the importance of the metropolitan regions for positioning the respective

⁵ They approximately correspond to the metropolitan regions in the 2000 German spatial planning report (Antikainen 2005: 451).

⁶ The boundaries of the four administrative districts of Baden Württemberg are not the same as the boundaries of the metropolitan regions. Thus the administrative district of Stuttgart includes the regional associations East Württemberg, Heilbronn-Franken and the Stuttgart regional association. However, the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart also includes the regional associations of Nordschwarzwald and Neckar-Alb, which belong to the administrative districts of Karlsruhe and Tübingen.

⁷ Göttsche-Stellmann et al (2005: 461 f.) criticize not only the differing systems of reference but also the basis upon which the MEGAs are grouped, which they describe as a black box. For instance, eight German cities are classified as MEGAs, yet the same cities differ significantly in terms of their DATAR rankings (categories 3 to 6) and in terms of the index values awarded them by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (30.9 to 1.8).

country in the globalisation process. However, there is little agreement about whether metropolitan regions within the European Union may in future be able to act as units regardless of national borders. 47% of the experts thought this possible, 46% had an opposing view and the remaining 7% did not feel in a position to judge the issue (Kaltenegger 2006: 118 f.). One of the problems is that no clear Europe-wide definition of a metropolitan region is available. This is an obstacle to developing a unified EU subsidy policy in which the metropolitan regions could play a role. 58% of the experts questioned by Kaltenegger (2006: 10) therefore support the notion of a standard definition in order to avoid inappropriate use of the term.

The metropolitan regions increasingly provide supranational integration functions based on their international connections. Numerous economic areas cross the internal and sometimes also the external EU boundaries. Overarching spatial development strategies that transcend the approaches of the individual nations are thus necessary. The Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany (IKM 2005: 1) thus calls for methods and competences that allow the replacing of the old "island-type solutions" with integrated, regional concepts that overcome the "bureaucratic obstacles" that the European Union has created with its NUTS statistics. As integrated units that fit somewhere between the local level and NUTS Level 1, metropolitan regions are constrained by internal administrative borders. At the European level, this means that several applications are required and that project development, provision of means and implementation of measures "are made particularly difficult in and for metropolitan areas" (IKM 2006: 2). Behrend and Kruse (2001) see a policy deficit, as the formally defined, political decision-making structures and the "old" national system structures no longer match the "non-politically non-administratively defined, poly-structural, functional metropolitan regions". The systems of actors in metropolitan regions would therefore be the "correspondence address for European politics". As no such institutions exist that are able to create new, innovative structures, Behrend and Kruse (2001) talk of an inability to act, but also note the creation of numerous initiatives that act as a mouthpiece for metropolitan politics.⁸

Numerous authors (such as BMVBS 2007a, Steinacher 2007, METREX 2006, IKM 2005 and Kaltenegger 2006) see as essential a consistent metropolitan policy for the European Union and for the respective nation states. This would require an appropriate subsidising policy, the drawing-up by the European Commission of a green paper for metropolitan regions (BMVBS 2007a: 17), the development of metropolitan governance, as well as know-how transfer with regard to best-practice examples and Europe-wide benchmarking.

4.2 The European metropolitan regions within the Federal Republic of Germany

For a long time German spatial planning policy largely ignored the strategic importance of metropolitan regions for spatial development, in contrast with policies in other countries (Blotevogel 2002: 345). The reference to "urban agglomerations with international or large-scale impact" in the 1993 Orientation Framework for Spatial Planning can be seen as the first step towards the concept of metropolitan regions (Michael 1998: 362). For the first time, German metropolitan regions were interpreted as being part of a European system of centres. This system lies above that of the regional centres and offers important spaces for the provision of highest-value services,

⁸ Especially METREX, the network of European metropolitan regions founded in 1996.

infrastructure and culture (Sinz 2007a: 24). Another first was the inclusion of a geo-strategic, cartographic representation based on the concept of the Frenchman Brunet (Sinz 2007); this primarily uses symbols and does away with exact spatial delimitations. However, the report had no legal implication, it relied rather on persuasion (Knieling 2006: 481) and thus had little chance of significantly influencing development.

The Framework for Spatial Policy Activities (MKRO 1995) describes the metropolitan regions for the first time with the term "European metropolitan regions" and characterises them as "engines of social, economic and cultural development". In contrast to the eleven metropolitan regions of the Orientation Framework, the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning drew up a list of "orientation characteristics" that are "qualitative, spatially effective functional characteristics of critical relevance". This limited the number of metropolitan regions at the time to six (Berlin/Brandenburg, Hamburg, Munich, Rhine-Main, Rhine-Ruhr and Stuttgart). The urban region Halle/Leipzig/Saxony-Triangle was noted as a "potential metropolitan region". It combines the regions Halle/Leipzig and Dresden, which are separately listed in the Orientation Framework. For the first time, the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning provided firm guiding principles, planned measures and focuses for action for these European metropolitan regions (Points 6.2 and 6.3). In contrast with earlier documents, the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities only contains regional-strategic goals and abstract visualisations. It therefore leaves leeway for concrete action and implementation by the states that must take account of the European metropolitan regions in their respective state development programmes or plans. However there has to date been no empirical investigation of this topic (Blotevogel 1998: 25). Some federal states included the metropolitan region category in their spatial planning, nonetheless there was no "widespread political response" (Blotevogel 2006b: 6).

4.2.1 Functions of the metropolitan regions

European metropolitan regions are to act as "normative guiding principles for spatial development policy" (ARL et al 2007: 5) and should help "maintain the performance and competitiveness of Germany and Europe and accelerate the process of European integration" by acting as "engines of social, economic and cultural development" (MKRO 1995: 27).

It is important to note that the concept of metropolitan regions represents a spatial as well as a functional category. Spatially speaking, metropolitan regions consist of one (monocentric) or several (polycentric) urban cores and the surrounding area, as long as the latter possesses locational factors of a similar quality to those of the core(s). Functionally speaking, a metropolitan region is a "cluster" of metropolitan facilities that due to the spatially extensive effects of its functions (see below) acts as an engine for regional and national development (Blotevogel 2005c: 642). Currently, the economic geography approach dominates the functional definition of a metropolitan region (BMVBS 2007a: 2). The Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany sees metropolitan regions as the "territorial backbone of the global network economy"; they contribute to the improvement of national innovation and competitive capabilities, are beacons of international and European influence, and ensure the integration of the country into the global economy (BMVBS 2007a: 3).

Indicators of metropolitan functions are used for the characterisation of metropolitan regions in Germany. As early as 2002 Blotevogel (2002: 346) defined the following three functional areas:

- Decision and control functions: Metropolitan regions as political and economic power centres with headquarters of international companies, a high percentage of advanced producer services and political power centres such as seats of government, etc.
- Innovation and competitive functions: High density of R&D facilities, creative milieu, high-level cultural offerings, infrastructure for large cultural or sports events.
- Gateway functions: Good international accessibility due to integration into international transport networks; high potential access to knowledge, information and markets; good facilities for fairs and congresses; and technically advanced telecommunications.

Recently the symbolic function of the metropolitan region has been added, both in terms of encouraging a sense of identity internally and in terms of increasing the attractiveness of the region externally (BMVBS 2007a: 3). Blotevogel (2006b: 10) summarises this function as including image, culture, media, events and urban built form.

Based on the first three of these metropolitan functions, the current spatial planning report issued by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005: 178) provides a comprehensive set of indicators as a basis for the at times still intensive discussion about the definition of metropolitan regions. The intention is to counter arguments that there is "no empirical proof" for the existence of these regions and that the model map expresses no more than "political desires" (Reimer 2007a). Köppen (2006: 296) goes so far as to talk of an "apparently diffuse amalgam of hierarchical-functional approaches" such that the identification of metropolitan regions seems based rather on the "labelling of urban agglomerations that are seen as worthy of development" than on "provable indicators".

European integration is increasingly linking the metropolitan regions through their transnational connections into the European system of city regions. As the network of German cities is arranged according to a division-of-labour principle, it offers the individual metropolitan regions a chance to take a leading role in particular functional domains in the "second league" of European metropolitan regions (Blotevogel 2005c: 646). In this context, metropolitan regions are increasingly acting independently and try to establish themselves at the boundary between the European network and nation states. They thus occupy the interfaces between national and European/global control systems (Kujath, von Schlippenbach 201: 81). The Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany also sees a "clear European orientation" among German metropolitan regions (BMVBS 2007a: no pagination). In contrast to monocentric structures the close, spatial proximity of important cities can lead to functional spatial connections that cross the individual administrative city boundaries. Such densifications may create a bundle of locational factors that can lead to shifts in urban hierarchies (Adam et al 2005: 426). The polycentric metropolitan region of the Rhine-Ruhr is an example.

There is no agreement in the specialist literature on whether metropolitan regions represent a new, top level category of central places (see, for example, Blotevogel 1998; Knieling 2001; Aring 2005).

4.2.2 Developments since the turn of the millennium

In 2001 seven metropolitan regions and the Hannover region created the "Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany", a "forum for representing their own interests" (Adam et al 2005: 417). Since its founding, the Initiative has helped establish

regular information exchange and a growth in cooperation between members, and also led to a "new perception and evaluation of the metropolitan regions" (BMVBS 2007a: 1).

In 2005, four more regions were recognised as metropolitan regions by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning: Nürnberg, Hannover/Braunschweig/Göttingen, the Rhine/Neckar triangle and Bremen. In contrast to the situation in the 1990s, the new metropolitan regions attracted a certain amount of regional support and media resonance (Blotevogel 2006b: 6). At the same time, the current spatial planning report (BBR 2005) was published, which, for the first time, contained a system of indicators for metropolitan regions.

In spite of the new conceptual approach used in the Orientation Framework and the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities, Blotevogel (2006a: 461 f.) notes that in planning practice there was a "high level of continuity in terms of self-image and tools", that existed independently of the fundamental changes in framework conditions. He therefore believes that a new discussion about the further development of guiding principles for spatial planning and action strategies was overdue. The new guiding principles that were agreed upon in 2006 build on the concept of the "European metropolitan regions in Germany" and substantiate it. In contrast with earlier documentation, the metropolitan regions have a "remarkably prominent position" (Blotevogel 2006a: 467). The new guidance is also more ambitious in that it not only relates to the activities and tools of spatial planning itself, but also discusses ways in which other fields may use the concept of metropolitan regions to realign their activities and subsidising priorities (Knieling 2006: 481). Growth areas outside the metropolitan region catchment areas are also listed. They are often important regional centres of innovation and locations for specialised technology and are to be supported in the development of their specialised profiles (Lutter 2006: 444) (Chapter 5.3.2). A revision of the guiding principles that will include the concept of European catchment areas is planned (Köhler 2007c).

The guiding principles are only discussion papers with no legally binding status. However, they are aimed at all decision makers in spatial, state and regional planning and are intended to provide an orientation framework for the various planning tools, e. g. plans, programmes, etc. (Goppel 2006: 645). They do not contain planning stipulations such as goals or principles for spatial planning and therefore do not force specific stipulations on the plans of the states and regions (MKRO 2006: 703).

The continued lack of substantiation is problematic: there are no details as to how individual policies (e. g. regional policy) should be implemented nor as to the nature of useful political support for metropolitan regions (Richter 2006: 666). Demonstration projects of spatial planning are therefore intended to serve as instruments for practical implementation, in the same way as in the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities. They should, for instance, give substance to the concept of communities of responsibility, the organisation of cooperative processes between metropolitan regions and other regions, as well as self-organisation in dynamic growth areas outside the metropolitan regions (Gatzweiler 2006: 678).

Experts rate as strengths of the national strategy approach, firstly, the fact that the guiding principles are a fundamental document for all decision-makers at the level of the metropolitan regions and, secondly, the level of participation of relevant actors. The non-binding, informal character and the over-generalised style are seen as weaknesses: 50 % of the experts criticised the lack of precisely formulated goals (Kaltenegger 2006: 109).

4.2.3 Future development of the concept

The future form and development of the concept is hotly discussed. This concerns, among other things, the possible recognition of additional metropolitan regions. Walcha (2006) predicts continued discussion about metropolitan regions, for instance about the potential candidates Erfurt and Rostock, while the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany sees the potential in Germany exhausted by the eleven existing metropolitan regions (BMVBS 2007a: 12) and recommends drawing a line and concentrating on European comparisons (IKM 2005a: 3). Reimer (2007a) does not believe the stepwise expansion of the circle of metropolitan regions to be complete and points out the dangers for the real metropolitan regions such as Munich or Stuttgart of "watering down the concept". Similarly Scholich (2008: 5) warns of "metropolitan region inflation". Lutter (2007) sees even the extension made in 2005 as a "purely political process" that wanted to avoid putting the brakes on bottom-up initiatives. It is in the end a political decision as to "how many metropolitan regions are considered worth subsidising", as it is not possible to provide accurate thresholds that determine when a large urban region becomes a metropolitan region (Adam et al 2005: 430).


At present the German metropolitan regions cover "the whole spectrum from pioneer regions to laggard regions" and are not yet the engines of development suggested in the metropolitan region definition. The concept of metropolitan regions must therefore be seen as a "normative concept" with "programmatic statements concerning a desired future" (ARL et al 2007: 8). Among experts surveyed, 82% believed that in future no new metropolitan regions will be established while 41% think it possible that metropolitan regions that cannot fulfil the stipulated requirements may be stripped of the title (Kaltenegger 2006: 119). Also the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 7) fears that the promise of metropolitanism may prove to be like "an (outstanding) loan" if some of the German metropolitan regions fail to keep this promise and become "untrustworthy".

The situation in the Federal Republic in terms of the formulation of requirements for metropolitan region policy is similar to that of the European level. An important role is played by policies aimed at improving locational factors, both hard (traffic infrastructure, etc.) and soft (culture, living environment, etc.), and at building up internal and external networks (Blotevogel 2006: 13 f.). The federal government is to reduce obstacles to development, strengthen the internal performance capabilities of the metropolitan regions and use federal initiatives to help low-performing metropolitan regions to catch up (ARL et al 2007: 10). Blotevogel (1998: 17 f.) is very sceptical about the scope of the concept of metropolitan regions as a formal instrument of state planning, as its "new view of the region as a whole" can hardly be successful in mobilising and bundling fragmented resources through "top-down management using hard spatial planning laws". This would rather require implementation at the political level, supplemented by "some formal anchoring in state planning programmes and plans".

Sinz (2007a: 24) describes the metropolitan region concept as a "success story": with only a guiding principle and with no additional subsidies or planning instruments it has been possible to kick start numerous metropolitan regions into positioning themselves for European competition through regional activities that transcend the administrative boundaries. The change in the valuation of the concept from a descriptive term in the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities to a strategic instrument for external positioning and for internal image improvement can clearly be seen in the examples of Rhine-Neckar and Nürnberg. In both cases the enticement of the title of metropolitan

region catalysed a kind of "bottom-up process" that mobilised endogenous potentials and brought together a variety of groups of actors to work towards a common goal (Kaltenegger 2006: 13). Further development of the concept by adding cross-border regions, extending the development pole concept, and re-conceptualising endogenous regional disparities is being considered (Aring 2007a). It is essential that metropolitan-oriented policy be based on overall acceptance by the residents and the actors concerned. While a broadly participatory process drawing up guiding principles could provide the basis for discussion of the metropolitan region concept among such parties, there has to date been little inclusion of residents in such processes⁹ and the lack of practical application of the concept has led even planners to perceive it as being removed from reality (Riethe 2008) or incomplete (Ludwig 2006). This has resulted in a high level of ignorance and faulty understanding of the concept, especially among municipal actors (Chapters 6–8).

Map 1: The current metropolitan regions in the Federal Republic of Germany



Source: Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2007): *Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland*, Werkstatt Praxis Heft 52

Design: H. Megerle
Cartography: R. Szydlak

⁹ "For ten years the residents of the metropolitan regions have not noticed anything, this needs to change, it is necessary to work with the instrument" (Walcha 2006)

4.3 Metropolitan regions in France and Switzerland

In 2000, DATAR presented "Aménager la France 2020 – mettre les territoires en mouvement", guiding principles for spatial development policy under amended framework conditions. It described the metropolitan regions as engines of development (Guigou 2000: 21), but also emphasised the strong disparities in the French urban system. In 2003, DATAR laid the basis for a paradigm shift with its publication on a "new spatial development policy for France". This resulted directly in the allocation of EUR 3.5 million to support a call for metropolitan cooperation between the metropolitan regions outside Paris.

The government strategy aims to strengthen economic capacity, research and education, and improve cultural offerings and gateway functions in the regions selected thus enhancing their international competitive position (CIADT 2003: 33). In addition, the policies of the various government departments are to be gradually adapted to the requirements of the metropolitan regions and cooperation between the cities and nearby towns to be supported (DATAR 2005: 6). In the context of continuing to strengthen the metropolitan presence, CIADT (2003: 39) plans to build upon the call for cooperation with the development of an implementation strategy that will provide the necessary action guidelines, including specific projects to improve European and global positioning.

In contrast with Germany, French metropolitan regions are thus not obliged to fulfil specific criteria in advance; instead they receive state support in order to build up metropolitan functions. Other specific elements of French spatial planning are metropolitan contracts, spatial planning premiums and other targeted, financial subsidies that have no equivalent in Germany. It is noteworthy that local and regional actors have to develop their own governance system in order to benefit from state subsidies. This procedure is particularly important because insufficient coordination and cooperation between the various actors involved in metropolitan regions has proved to be a significant obstacle for competitiveness (Kamal-Chaoui 2005: 204 ff.). This situation is aggravated by extreme administrative fragmentation. France has over 36 000 independent municipalities, two thirds of which have fewer than 500 inhabitants, and is thus the country with the highest number of municipalities in Europe. These "archaic traditions" are a considerable obstacle to modern spatial planning (Morel 2006: 45). Territorial reorganisation has been discussed for fifty years, but to date all attempts at reform have failed (Morel 2006: 50). Attempts to improve the situation continue through the back door, i. e. by using special-purpose associations at the municipal level or metropolitan cooperation. The administration of economic subsidies is rendered significantly more difficult by the non-hierarchical organisation of the various territorially-based authorities that has led to a "barely comprehensible and largely dysfunctional distribution of responsibilities" (Zimmermann-Steinhart 2003: 74 f.), as well as to the concentration of responsibility for research and technology policies in Paris.

French experts – in contrast with their German colleagues (Chapter 4.2.2) – see particularly the non-binding, informal character of the national strategy as a strength. The accurate formulation of goals is also seen in a very positive light. The French showed a neutral attitude towards the fact that the national strategy is worded in general terms – again in contrast with the Germans. However, there seemed to be some uncertainty with regard to the actual binding character of the national strategy: a surprising 29% of the experts rated the binding character as a strength (Kaltenegger 2006: 110).

First tendencies of the changed spatial policy reveal an atmosphere of departure in the metropolitan regions involved (Megerle 2008), but also slower implementation in planning practice than initially intended (Touche 2006a: 7). As in Germany, in France there have been a number of network approaches using "variable geometries" as a function of the respective issues, as well as some concerns about the creation of an additional and possibly competing planning level. Touche (2006a: 11) therefore believes it necessary to establish the concept as soon as possible at a political level and to facilitate, in addition, the rapid integration of all groups of actors as well as a rapid transfer from planning to implementation. Similar to the situation in Germany, there are problems with the lack of an institutional and democratically legitimated metropolitan level (Morel 2006: 48), as well as with insufficient governance systems and considerable political-administrative fragmentation (see Megerle 2008 and Megerle 2008a).

Among experts surveyed, 43 % thought it possible that in future, additional metropolitan regions might be established in France. Nearly three-quarters of the French experts believed that the "metropolitan region" title might be withdrawn if expectations were not fulfilled (Kaltenegger 2006: 119).

The increasing concentration of economic activities in metropolitan regions also led Switzerland to classify these areas as engines of economic, social and cultural development (ARE 2005: 11) and to adopt a new orientation in spatial development policies. In addition to the internationally positioned metropolitan regions, Switzerland has also identified smaller growth engines that have particular, often traditional, know-how (e. g. micro-technology, watch-making industry). Growth factors in these areas are also to be retained and, if possible, improved.

There was no sign of an orientation of politics and planning towards metropolitan regions (Odermatt 2004: 48) until 2001 when the Swiss Federal Council produced the "Report on agglomeration policy" that provided the base for "active policy in favour of urban agglomerations" (ARE 2005: 20). There is as yet, however, no guiding principle that enjoys political support (Rumley 2006: unpaginated). However, the current spatial development report of 2005 includes a Swiss Spatial Concept for political decision makers. Nonetheless, there is still little political awareness; discussions mainly take place at expert level and rarely in a political context (Wegelin 2007). The urban agglomeration policy of the federal government is subsidiary to the activities of the provinces and municipalities and includes agglomeration programmes and demonstration projects (ARE 2005: 20).

The spatial structure of Switzerland shows considerable fragmentation. As all metropolitan regions run diametrical to the provincial borders, an increasing divergence between the political-administrative and the economic-functional boundaries can be observed. Behrend and Kruse (2001: 203) reveal the development of new spheres of action that involve players that are not democratically legitimised and that have little in common with political-administrative boundaries. In addition, Switzerland must respond to the problem of metropolitan regions having increasing proportions of flows and interconnections that cross national borders. This problem is particularly acute in the Metropolitan Region of Basel, where the majority of residents live outside Switzerland (Chapter 8.3). Close cooperation with neighbouring countries is also essential for the Zurich and Geneva-Lausanne metropolitan regions, as metropolitan-wide policies are otherwise only "piecework" (Blöchinger 2006: 11). A solution to the problems resulting from the discrepancy between functional and administrative territories can currently not be envisaged.

Swiss experts, similar to the German experts (Chapter 4.2.2) but in contrast with the French ones (Chapter 4.3), see the generalised style and the non-binding character of the national strategy concepts as weaknesses. In Switzerland, there is clearly some uncertainty regarding the strategy concepts, as 31 % of the experts see the precisely worded goals as a strength, while 38.5 % fail to recognise the existence of such goals (Kaltenegger 2006: 112).

4.4 Eurodistricts and European catchment areas as transnational approaches

Cross-border spatial planning generally has to deal with additional challenges that are usually caused by the differing political-administrative structures, heterogeneous planning cultures and diverging interests. In addition to arrangements at the formal, political level, informal agreements between the participating actors are required to find consensus and common goals and to implement cross-border concepts (Scott 2005: 409). Scott (2005: 414) believes that there is currently little freedom of action for cross-border spatial planning, due to the lack of a legal framework, insufficient financial resources and the contradiction between the coherence goal of the EU and the political logic of interregional competition. The ESDP recommends the development of cross-border spatial development concepts that are to be taken into account in the respective national contexts as well as regular coordination of all spatial planning and measures (European Commission 1999: 47).

The Eurodistricts, which were introduced in 2003, are to promote German and French cross-border cooperation in areas such as traffic, energy, health and environmental policy as well as tourism, to promote regional awareness and to build up each region as a unified economic location (state portal Baden-Württemberg 29.01.2007). The extent to which the concept of the Eurodistricts will include legal or financial specifications has not yet been finally decided (BAK 2006: 14).

The term European catchment area was used in the state development plan for Baden-Württemberg with reference to the term "European metropolitan region", which is used in the whole Federal Republic of Germany. The context was the goal of further developing the upper Rhine area to a metropolitan region (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg).

The extent to which cross-border, metropolitan catchment areas such as those at the upper Rhine and at Lake Constance can be included in the concept of European metropolitan regions still has to be clarified with the federal states (Lütke-Daldrup 2007).

5 Issues of implementation in planning practice

Chapter 5 describes issues connected with the implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice, as seen in the specialist literature and planning theory. This information is primarily intended as a basis for the classification of empirical surveys (Chapter II) and the conclusions drawn from them (Chapter III). Overlaps cannot be completely avoided, due to the close interconnection between the topics.

5.1 Re-orientation or paradigm shift in spatial planning?

The evaluation of the new orientation in spatial planning policy, with its shifting focus towards growth engines, has led to an extensive discussion process that has not yet provided a consensus, not even within the field of spatial planning. This could contribute to a polarisation of the positions (Knieling 2006: 483).

Aring and Sinz (2006: 451) talk about a modernisation impulse in German spatial planning but although Blotevogel (2006a: 460) sees a change from "work as usual" he categorically denies the existence of paradigm change in spatial planning policy. Köppen (2006: 293 f.) sees the "serious subsidising" of metropolitan regions as a "clear break with the ideal of creating equal living conditions in all regions". Placing competitiveness before social integration implies to him a "programmatic change of direction" towards a neo-liberal strategy. The discussion was heated up by an interview with the Federal President Köhler in 2004, in which he questioned the concept of providing equal living conditions in all regions of the Federal Republic of Germany. These comments were triggered by a study (Dohnanyi, Most 2004) in which the subsidies directed towards the development of the East German states were investigated. It was stated for the first time "that it must be accepted that certain inequalities cannot be remedied". The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning does not question the concept of equal living conditions in general, but finds it necessary to re-prioritise the mandate for regional equity and to re-balance targets for growth and equity-oriented intervention in the light of the current challenges (MKRO 2006: 708). However, the state secretary at the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs talks of a dual strategy that includes a competitive orientation as well as equity-oriented intervention to support and bring on disadvantaged and peripheral areas (Lütke-Daldrup 2007). This is seen very critically by representatives of rural areas, as there is no specific guiding principle for the development of these areas¹⁰ (Chapter 5.3).

The metropolitan region concept implies in any case innovation in spatial policy. Blotevogel (2006b: 11) explains this firstly with reference to the new orientation in content towards economic policy goals and secondly with the new orientation in procedure that results from the necessary autonomous building of groups of actors and the accompanying changes in management mechanisms. However, it seems that in planning practice the label "metropolitan region" may be valued and used as a marketing tool, but its deeper meaning in terms of spatial development policy has hardly been reflected at all in practical implementation (Baumheier 2007). Only future developments will show whether these changes can indeed be considered a paradigm change.

¹⁰ "These concepts initiate a paradigm change in spatial policy" (Länder-Arbeitsgruppe 2006: 2).

5.2 Flexible geometries versus strict territorial delimitations

One of the most intensively discussed questions in connection with the metropolitan region concept is the delimitation of metropolitan regions. Two directly opposed approaches are used. The one uses a clear, territorial delimitation based on administrative boundaries, usually those of districts or regions. The other uses "flexible or variable geometries" and sees the metropolitan core as a starting point from which emanate numerous open-boundary cooperative network structures whose forms vary according to the specific issue at hand.

The latter model is based on the increasing discrepancy between functional and administrative territories. The current spatial realities of polycentric regions characterised by complex economic interactions accord ever less with the old territorial structures and political-administrative structures. In addition, when seen on a global scale, most European cities are too small. In order to meet the challenges of global competition they must therefore achieve their critical mass through flexible cooperation with the surrounding areas (Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften 2005: 23). Metropolitan regions can thus hardly be established as regional entities, because definitions based on the actors involved means that the territorial boundaries vary, depending on the function considered ("form follows function") (Kujath, von Schlippenbach 2001: 77). In addition, metropolitan functions are not only limited to the cores but also found in the surrounding areas (Adam 2006: 19). Planning practice has long seen that spatial overlaps make clear spatial boundaries impossible (Köhler 2007c). In this context, Blotevogel (2002a: 35) speaks of a new spatial semantic that manifests itself as a networked space in which metropolitan regions are the most important, structure-defining nodes.

The individual spatial categories are already less sharply defined and delimited in the Orientation Framework for Spatial Planning and the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities. The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (MKRO 1997a: 53) emphasises that metropolitan regions are "not spatial entities with firm external boundaries, but functionally, interconnected areas that influence their extended surroundings". In the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities, the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (MKRO 1995: 28) classified a "firm outer delimitation" as "not possible or useful". They also, however, saw as unavoidable using "one or several interlinked agglomeration areas, including their outskirts" for orientation.

The 2005 Spatial Planning Report (BBR 2005) was the first time that spatial structure types were divided according to their accessibility from the centre, i.e. into central, intermediate and peripheral areas, which fairly obviously were not precisely delimited. The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005: 175) justified this approach by arguing the impossibility of separating rural areas from metropolitan areas in a way worthy of the problems faced, as these areas intersect with and are functionally dependent on one another. It was similarly argued that effective spatial planning policy requires the establishment of appropriate cooperation networks and the creation of large-scale communities of responsibility that are organised "across spatial functional variations". The terms used, in particular for the peripheral areas, led to intense discussions that were dominated by fears of marginalisation on the part of the actors¹¹ classified in this manner (Chapter 5.3).

¹¹ Richter (2006: 666) sees the choice of terms as a message that emphasises the centrally allocated importance of the metropolitan regions and vice versa the only conceded, derived importance of the other regions.

Due to the emphasis on fields of action and problems as well as on the "soft" spatial categories for the metropolitan catchment areas, the new guiding principles demonstrate a departure from traditional spatial categories. Cooperation between the metropolises and their partners in the catchment areas is intended in the long term to lead to the development of "self-organising, regional communities of responsibility" that do not replace the current administrative spatial structures of the states and regions but "supplement them in a meaningful way" (Aring, Sinz 2006: 458).

As part of the city ranking of the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning metropolitan functions were recorded at the municipal level and then regionalised, thus creating spatial representations that more clearly reveal the distribution and concentration of metropolitan functions. This regionalisation was intended to identify economic and functional-spatial interactions and potentials, but not to move towards a delimitation of metropolitan regions, as the spatial representations have "no normative legal entitlement" (Adam et al 2005: 426). Guiding Principle 1 shows the spatial categories of the metropolitan cores and the inner and outer catchment areas as empirically demonstrated by analysis of metropolitan functions and accessibility indicators concerning traffic and commuter flows. The internal core is based on travel time isochrones that were calculated using the accessibility model¹² of the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning. This procedure takes account of the important interaction between all metropolitan functions, which are not only concentrated in the metropolitan core. Polycentric areas therefore benefit from the aggregated, regional method of analysis (Lutter 2007).

The lack of criteria for a scientifically founded delimitation of a metropolitan region makes delimitation one of the most common problems in metropolitan areas (Broja, Castells 1997: 185). The use of gross domestic product as an indicator for competitiveness does not produce a clear spatial representation, as there are considerable variations in the surrounding municipalities. Approaches based on the intensity of interconnections and flows or on the degree of urbanisation require the definition of threshold values in order to delimit the regions. Different delimitation concepts result in different regional patterns, particularly so in polycentric regions. Adam (1006: 21) therefore believes that the only option is to extend existing planning regions in a flexible manner by using cooperative relationships and thus to also deal with the "allocation problems" between "inside" and "outside". However, she thinks that managing a large region of this sort as a complete entity is almost unimaginable and that spatial integration and its organisation are thus important issues for the future. Adam (2006: 25) goes on to argue that it is essential to accept the use of variable geometries, as the multitude of interconnections does not allow the clear definition of regional relations. However, she also sees spatial delimitations (e. g. the area of responsibility for associations) as necessary for organisational reasons. These delimitations will "inevitably have the character of an amalgamatory mass" with small, organisationally stable sub-areas but also an openness to flexible cooperation with neighbouring areas. Adam and Göttsche-Stellmann (2002: 520) state that "the larger a metropolitan region, the larger is – in principle – its development potential", but this is put into perspective by the realisation that "as the size of the region increases so the fractionalisation and complexity of the relations between the actors grow" (2002: 518). According to the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany, the spatial reach of the metropolitan region must be adapted to the metropolitan functions, as the metropolitan relevance of the sub-regions is assessed according to their organisational integration and

¹² The core can be reached within one hour by both public transport and motor vehicle (Einig et al 2006: 626).

not their various spatial delimitations (BMVBS 2007a: 21). Fürst (2008: 224) traces the delimitation selected to the players involved. Spatial delimitation is much more important for political-administrative actors than for economic players, whose spaces of cooperation are functionally structured.

The delimitation of metropolitan regions is, at least at supra-regional level, also influenced by the political aim of indirectly achieving a territorial restructuring of the federal states through the division of the entire country into different areas surrounding the various metropolitan regions (Baumheier 2007). Jessel (2005) regards this as unfeasible, as some metropolitan regions, such as Bremen, currently do not demonstrate the required qualities and some regions near the border, such as Saarbrücken or Trier, have more flows and interconnections across the national border than within Germany.

Planning theory statements show increasing divergence from the metropolitan regions found in planning practice, which are defined as "areas of political cooperation" and usually show a clear territorial delimitation. A "trend towards spatial expansion, if not over-expansion" can currently be seen, as neighbouring regions increasingly "jump onto the bandwagon" (Blotevogel 2006a: 467). The map of metropolitan regions produced by the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany (IKM 2007a: 31) shows such large territories that nearly half of the area of the Federal Republic of Germany is integrated into a metropolitan region (Map 1). In many cases, these large regions result from a fear of marginalisation in the "peripheral areas", where people are concerned that the area might be excluded from current economic growth,¹³ as well as from discrepancies between planning theory and planning practice. "Splitting" existing administrative units meets with considerable resistance (Chapter 6.4). Fürst (2008: 226) recognises overstretching, in particular for metropolitan regions that are mainly determined by territorial governance.

Blotevogel urgently requests a clarification of terms, as metropolitan regions like Berlin-Brandenburg, which includes the whole area of Brandenburg, as well as the similar cases of Hamburg (including the Lüneburger Heide and Wendland) and Nürnberg (including Oberfranken) have little to do with the analytical concept of metropolitan regions. The integration of a disadvantaged area such as the Lüchow-Dannewitz into two metropolitan regions seems "hard to comprehend" and extremely "arbitrary" (Reimer 2007a). Blotevogel (2006: 467) sees strategic partnerships between a metropolitan region and its wider catchment area as useful, but as somewhat different to the "normal conceptualisation of a metropolitan region". The latter implies, according to Blotevogel (2005c: 642), an integration of the surrounding areas only "where these possess comparable locational factors".

The large-scale structures that have actually emerged (Map 1) also no longer correspond to the definition of metropolitan regions found in Guiding Principle 1 (MKRO 2006: 710) or to the metropolitan indicators of the spatial planning report (BBR 2005). Problematic is, in particular, the requirement for the bundling and concentration of political and economic nerve centres, R&D facilities, cultural offerings and a creative milieu as well as a high level of internationally recognised historical, political, cultural and townscape significance. This can only relate to the metropolitan cores, never to disadvantaged areas.

¹³ Blotevogel (2005a: 14) refers to fears in "North-Rhine Westphalia", which does not belong to the metropolitan region Rhine-Ruhr and where people feel "left behind and discriminated against".

5.3 Large-scale communities of responsibility or marginalisation of rural areas?

In connection with the new orientation of spatial development policy the discussion concerning the relationship between various spatial categories, in particular between metropolitan regions and rural regions, has become more intensive. As these discussions are also of major importance for the study area in southern Germany, a theoretical analysis appears necessary.

5.3.1 Metropolitan regions as growth engines and the backbone of the Lisbon strategy

Various theorists have reacted to modern telecommunications by predicting, among other things, the "end of geography", the "decline of the cities" and their replacement by a dispersed spatial distribution of economic activities. Real developments have shown that spatial proximity remains a stimulating element of high importance (Laaser, Soltwedel 2005: 67 ff.) Rather than de-concentration, certain metropolitan regions show increasing concentration. As a consequence of globalisation and metropolitanisation, Krätke (2007: 144) sees an increasing development of large metropolitan regions to crystallisation points of total economic growth" and therefore as "engines" and "outstanding nodes of the integration of Europe in the global economy". Ritter (2002: 15) therefore describes metropolitan regions as the "clear winners of globalisation processes". Metropolitan regions are also "beneficiaries of demographic change", but are "in increasing competition for employees, in particular for highly qualified personnel" (BMVBS 2007: 44). The concentration of "tacit knowledge" in these centres poses the risk that the new economy will increase disparities ("technology gaps") between the centre and the periphery. The Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 2) thus detects "new spatial inequalities" with growth, stagnation and shrinking regions existing right next to each other. This leads to a deterioration of the relationship between centre and periphery.

Critics doubt that "Germany needs to focus preferentially on large centres to avoid falling behind in global competition" (Reimer 2007:3). Although various regional economic theories (e.g. growth theory, new economic geography) are used in an attempt to find causal links between economic growth and agglomeration areas, they do not vindicate the general assumption that overall economic growth benefits from redirecting subsidies to fast-growing regions and that abandoning equity-orientated intervention is therefore justified (Blotevogel 2006a: 467). Elaborate theoretical concepts of convergence and divergence assume catch-up processes and trickle-down effects on the one hand, while dependence theories and cluster theories (e.g. Krugman and Porter) suggest better growth chances for highly-developed areas. A clear statement based on empirical data is currently difficult to make. A European comparison showed a divergence favouring advanced regions (Frankenberg 2005: 189), but disadvantaged regions such as Emsland (Danielzyk 2007) have profited from appropriate subsidy programmes to improve their position. Even the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 8 f.) cannot derive rules from the economic theories that justify "preferred development of metropolitan regions at the cost of other urban regions" and thus demand the empirical identification of factors that are crucial for the performance of metropolitan regions.

Knieling (2006: 418 f.) has a rather critical view of the potential impact of spatial planning. He asks whether by providing appropriate models (right to designing the structure), spatial planning is indeed able to strengthen an economy that is already

concentrated in urban agglomeration areas due to framework conditions, or whether spatial planning merely tracks current developments, i. e. the design of spatial structures is determined by economic patterns. A strategic focus on metropolitan regions as growth centres may have disadvantages, in spite of the fact that the current response is mainly positive. Knieling (2006: 482 f.) sees such disadvantages, for example, in the focus on economic aspects with resulting disadvantages for an integrated and future-oriented spatial development, in the possible reduction of the adaptability of certain regions, as well as in the increase of the concentration of population in metropolitan regions. High consequential costs in the ecological, infrastructural and social fields can also not be ruled out¹⁴ (Hahne 2006: 63).

5.3.2 Growth regions outside metropolitan regions

The intensifying discussion concerning the new orientation of spatial development policy has at times led to over-simplification whereby metropolitan regions are equated to growth regions and rural or peripheral areas are equated to stagnation regions. The restriction to two spatial categories (metropolitan regions and purely rural areas) does not do justice to the complexity of the spatial situation in Germany. A detailed analysis further shows that the spread of key economic indicators within the German metropolitan regions is comparable to that of other regions. In addition to weak metropolitan regions, there are also growth regions outside the metropolitan catchment areas, some of them with above-average growth rates and few problems (Köhler 2007). Aring (2005: 28) requested a "differentiated supplementation and extension" of the metropolitan region concept, for instance by identifying and supporting spatial growth engines outside metropolitan regions. These regions were therefore integrated into Guiding Principle 1 as "Growth areas outside inner metropolitan catchment areas" in 2006. The same year, Aring and Reuther (2006: 1) created the expression "regiopoies" as "a working term for a new research and policy field". It was intended to emphasise the development chances of these areas, which previously had received little attention in either academic (Köhler 2007: 6), politic or public realms (BMVBS 2008: 7). These regions with their "significant contributions to growth" play an important role and thus challenge spatial planning to develop suitable subsidising strategies (Zimmermann 2007: 8 f.). Similar considerations can be seen in France (Esparre 2007).

An increasing tendency to integrate regiopoies into growth strategies can be observed (e.g. ARL et al 2007: 10). This is supplemented by cross-border European catchment areas. These areas are to be established on a national level by integrating them into guiding principles and are to receive "appropriate consideration in the territorial cohesion policy of the EU" (Lehmann et al 2007: 1). A comparative study¹⁵ is to be conducted as part of a European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) project. An initiative to promote European catchment areas is currently being established (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2007: 3).

Köhler (2007b: 117) still sees considerable research deficits for growth regions outside metropolitan catchment areas, as little is known about the reasons for dynamic growth in areas that may not have a single large city and that were in some cases previously disadvantaged. Furthermore, appropriate strategies for subsidising such areas are equally unknown. In this context, it is necessary to investigate the notion of "hidden

¹⁴ A comprehensive description of the current framework conditions as well as the problems of metropolitan regions and strategy recommendations can be found in ARL, DASL (2004).

¹⁵ Planned goal: "Increased European attention to European growth areas that are not metropolitan or rural areas" (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben; Regionalverband Hochrhein-Bodensee 2006: 2).

champions in hidden regions", where generally unknown world market leaders make significant contributions to economic development (Brandt, quoted in Aring, Reuther 2006: 11). It is possible that these regions benefit from the distance to the metropolitan regions as they perhaps represent "an attractive alternative". It is thus unclear what the effects of cooperation within the framework of a large-scale community of responsibility would be. A current study (BMVBS 2008) concerning the "success criteria for growth engines outside metropolitan regions" provided first indications and in 2008, a Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning (MORO) was started in the Lake Constance region.

5.3.3 A new orientation of spatial planning policy and its consequences for rural areas

Before the new orientation of spatial planning policy, politically driven spatial development was always dominated by the idea of "catching up" to create equal living conditions. This led as far as dividing areas into "lagging behind regions that need support" and areas that "need to be slowed down or should at least not be subsidised". This classification correlated to spatial categories, making "disadvantage a permanent attribute of rural areas", regardless of the actual situation that became increasingly differentiated (Aring, Sinz 2006: 455). Partially due to successes in regional development, the image of an urban-rural gradient is today an "oversimplification or even a misrepresentation", in particular for Western Germany (Aring 2007: 3). The spatial structure types used in the Spatial Planning Report (BBR 2005: 203) and an analysis by Aring and Sinz (2006) show that the existing spatial categories are no longer adequate for comparative spatial analysis nor for the identification of developmental variations or problems resulting from settlement structure. The three spatial types central, intermediate and peripheral areas used by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning all include rural areas.¹⁶ However, in the old federal states, the values for economic and demographic key indicators have a higher variance within the previous spatial categories (agglomeration areas, urban areas and rural areas) than between these categories (Aring, Sinz 2006: 456 f.). As early as the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities, the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (MKRO 1995: 9) judged the "general equating of rural with disadvantage" as "inappropriate" and has rejected a uniform category for "rural area" as inconsistent. The Framework for Spatial Policy Activities nonetheless emphasises the need for action in disadvantaged rural areas, as the changed framework conditions and the constant structural development trends often impact negatively on the disadvantaged rural areas and their development prospects (MKRO 1995: 10).

Supporters of the new orientation of spatial planning interpret this as abandoning a "nearly automated but factually no longer appropriate orientation of spatial development policy mainly in favour of rural areas" and instead assigning "equal importance to the development prospects of urban regions". They argue that despite the historically justified subsidising of disadvantaged regions and the still noticeable disparities between different areas of Germany, rural areas have been politically and institutionally overrepresented and that intense lobbying "aimed mainly at retaining the rights to subsidies and transfers" can be observed. At the same time rural areas – like

¹⁶ Central includes the large contiguous settlement areas with a high population density of approx. 1000 inhabitants per km². It includes approx. 11% of the territory of Germany, but 49% of the population and 57% of employed persons. Intermediate includes approx. 30% of the territory of Germany with approx. 25% of the population and a density of approx. 200 inhabitants per km². The periphery consists of the remaining territory (58%) and houses almost a quarter of the population with a density of less than 100 inhabitants per km² (Aring 2005: 9).

metropolitan regions – do not at present represent a "homogeneous problem category".¹⁷ The new orientation of spatial policy therefore represents nothing more than the end to a "no longer appropriate, systematic preference for one spatial category" (Aring, Sinz 2006: 455 ff.). Zimmermann (2007: 10) puts it much more strongly. He talks of an obvious conflict between equity-oriented intervention and national growth. If metropolitan regions are the engines of overall economic growth then it follows that the growth centres should be strengthened, because it is there that the "added value" for resources provided is highest. He thus believes that equity-oriented intervention that benefits disadvantaged areas can, even after considering its financial feasibility, only be justified as a distribution policy.

The form of the new guiding principles and strategies takes these notions into account (Chapter 4.2.2) in that the metropolitan regions are given an important role as growth engines. However, there is no "reversal of the traditional rural policy to a metropolitan policy". Although no separate guidance for rural areas was presented, all three guiding principles consider the problems, development potentials and possible action concerning rural, thinly populated and peripheral areas (Aring, Sinz 2006: 457). The guidance issued in 2006 emphasizes using and subsidising the development potentials of all regions, in contrast with earlier Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning documentation that gives metropolitan regions a pre-eminent role as growth engines.

However, the cartographic representation for the Guiding Principle 1 visually preferences the metropolitan regions and thus creates the impression that they are the "determining factor" (Blotevogel 2006: 467). From the rural point of view, the "concept of a balanced development of all areas" is replaced by a "growth-oriented concentration of subsidies on metropolitan regions" (Länder-Arbeitsgruppe 2006: 2). Blotevogel (2006b: 16 f.) also sees increasing signs of a political prioritisation of economic indicators of growth and competitiveness, while "equity, the classical spatial planning goal, is forced into a defensive position".

Not only metropolitan regions, but also rural areas are subject to intensive changes in economic structure. They too are affected by globalisation, demographic change and paradigm changes in spatial development policy, environmental protection and regional development strategies (Luick, Megerle 2007: 67). There are various diverging views of the role of rural areas under the changed framework conditions, depending on interpretation of the new guiding principles and perception of the circumstances. In extreme cases, an either/or polarisation between the different spatial categories develops.¹⁸ Hauk (2007a) thinks that increasing competition between the regions and a simultaneous reduction of finance will lead to an intensifying of competition that will disadvantage rural regions. Scheffold (2007) believes that when this is accompanied by a strengthening of the metropolitan regions it will lead to the rural regions being written off. Kujath (2005a: 9) similarly fears that the rise of the metropolitan regions could trigger "selective effects" that may lead to old industrial towns and rural regions being no longer competitive in an increasingly knowledge-based economy. The classification of sub-regions of the rural areas as peripheral or stabilisation areas (BBR 2005:19) evokes the image of marginalised areas that require subsidies. Kunzmann (2002: 18) explicitly talks of "loser regions, whose inhabitants can choose between moving to the

¹⁷ The delimitation of rural areas based on a population density level of 100 inhabitants per km² does not do justice to the current, complex situation. The "European Charter for Rural Areas" issued by the European Council therefore prefers a multi-functional definition of rural areas (quoted in BBR 2005: 203).

¹⁸ For instance, on 22 March 2007 the Academy for Rural Areas Baden-Württemberg (Akademie Ländlicher Raum Baden-Württemberg) hosted a meeting entitled "Metropolitan regions versus Rural Areas".

metropolis and staying at the inner periphery with an ever-decreasing quality of infrastructure".

The guiding principles have been clearly rejected by the representatives of rural regions. According to Reimer (2007: 2), they correspond much more with political desires than empirical reality. He fears that a spatial development policy in which the metropolises dominate provides a faulty economic and ecological orientation. Not all metropolitan regions are growth engines, and growth centres in rural regions are not sufficiently integrated. Action strategies based on this categorisation will therefore not make sufficient use of the growth potential available. A strategy for a future policy for rural areas is currently being developed (Bundesregierung 2007: 15) and the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection is working on a concept for rural space that is to direct discussion towards rural areas (Reimer 2006: 21). The Federal Government has set up an inter-ministerial working group called "Rural Areas" that by the end of 2008 is to come up with suggestions for coordinated action to ensure the continued development of rural areas (BMELV 2008). Blotevogel (2006b: 18) thinks nonetheless that the growing counter-discourse is currently not "effective enough" to "stop or marginalise the metropolitan region discourse".

5.3.4 Large-scale communities of responsibility and spill-over effects

Based on the new guiding principles, large-scale communities of responsibility are to be formed through partnerships between metropolitan regions and the areas surrounding them, creating a win-win situation for all participants. In this context the metropolitan cores have a particular responsibility that must also extend to "sub-regions that lack their own development potential (BBR 205: 189). The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (1997a: 54) explicitly states that the metropolitan regions are not to "cause a weakening of the regions and towns in their catchment areas". The aim must be to encourage development according to the "principle of decentralised concentration and networking" and to integrate the wider catchment area through participation in decentralised projects and improvement of regional mobility. The metropolises and the large-scale communities of responsibility are "obligatorily" linked to each other (Kawka 2007: 50). The idea is that within the so-called "large-scale communities of responsibility" the metropolitan cores and their inner and outer catchment areas (including the growth and stabilisation areas located within them) should form an integrated entity. Each sub-area within this entity is to take on specific functions that benefit the other sub-areas. This should strengthen the variety found within the entire area, make use of the functional characteristics of the sub-areas, and allow the stabilisation areas to profit from the positive developments in other regions (Einig et al 2006: 627). The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (2008) describes the concept of large-scale communities of responsibility as an "innovative instrument of a spatial planning policy that is focused on development and equity". A prerequisite for its success is the use of a "new understanding of planning" that promotes cooperation across levels, sectors and actors. Important is also the improved coordination of departmental policies that have a spatial impact and the regional adaptation of action plans (Rooks 2006: 642).

To date, the linking up of core city and the surrounding area has had limited success. The Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 7) sees the danger that only the metropolis will be acknowledged and that the metropolitan region concept will lose credibility.

Blotevogel (2006a: 468) fears that the theme of communities of responsibility may be dominated by "empty spatial planning rhetoric", as the associated action plans do not offer any clear answers. Similar fears are mentioned by Knieling (2006: 483) who thinks that inequalities between the growth cores and peripheries may increase. Leber and Kunzmann (2006: 59 f.) describe communities of responsibility as "fascinating" but also as a "very idealistic concept" to which daily politics will "only pay lip service", as it will not be possible to agree on necessary redistribution mechanisms. Even the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (2007: 64) see as key the question as to how the positive effects of the metropolitan regions can be made to work for their hinterland. Opponents of the large-scale communities of responsibility see the risk of an "exploitation of the growth centre by the surrounding areas" and propose securing the growth of the centres by giving them "autonomy", which may lead to long-term redevelopment for areas within a radius of approx. 80 km of the core (Zimmermann 2007: 12 ff.). Blatter (2008: 32 f.) even speaks in this context of metropolitan regions being "forced" into large-scale communities of responsibility that have nothing in common and are thus counter-productive.

Augustin (2006: 659) clearly differentiates between an inner catchment area ("fat belt") in which positive effects can be expected and the wider area, for which there is no empirical proof of positive spill-over effects, even when an international perspective is taken. Augustin therefore demands independent political approaches for peripheral, rural areas, as they will not benefit from subsidising the metropolitan regions. In his opinion, a metropolis-centred policy would not only inevitably mean "disadvantaging the – when judged in terms of area and population – majority of our country", something that could not be accepted without question, but would also threaten the chances of fulfilling the goals of the Lisbon Strategy (Augustin 2006: 660). Development concepts that rely on the spill-over effects from a metropolis into a "community of responsibility", are, according to Reimer (2007: 2), based more on idealism than on reality, in particular as the spill-over effects encompass at most the average commuter distance. Studies in Switzerland showed that medium and small urban settlements outside the metropolitan regions benefit only to a limited extent from the stimulus of the large, internationally important economic centres (Bundesrat 2001: 12). The States Working Group (Länder-Arbeitsgruppe 2006: 9) therefore requests that the activation and strengthening of endogenous potential in rural areas should be recognised as being of equal importance to "subsidies directed towards selective growth in the metropolitan regions". Hahne (2006: 62) goes furthest in this context by suggesting a contractual agreement between metropolises and periphery, as the periphery can "hardly rely on the voluntary acceptance of responsibility by the metropolitan core".

In general, differentiation of the rural areas with regard to their relation to the metropolitan cores seems crucial. Leber and Kunzmann (2006: 62) differentiate between rural areas close to a metropolis, intermediate rural areas and peripheral rural areas. They formulate independent strategies for each spatial category, strategies that have to emerge from the respective, specific, endogenous conditions. According to Mose (2005: 755), disadvantaged areas and peripheral areas will still require focused subsidies. However, he predicts that areas close to the metropolis will benefit from many positive spill-over effects, but will also be exposed to risks such as growing pressure for housing space and locational competition with conflicting potential land uses. In the mid-term these trends can endanger the attractiveness of the areas, especially in the absence of appropriate spatial development strategies. Leber and

Kunzmann (2006: 64 ff.) have developed three scenarios that show possible development paths.

- The "metropolis scenario" leads to a "division" of the rural areas into areas close to the metropolis that benefit, and peripheral regions that become increasingly empty and serve as reserve space for those functions that are "not economic or not wanted" in the metropolitan regions.
- The "cohesion scenario" looks for a compromise between subsidising the metropolitan regions and the rural areas and thus leads to a much more balanced spatial and settlement structure. There is however a clear regional gradient dependent on the degree of accessibility.
- The "pro-rural area scenario" leaves the metropolitan regions largely to market forces and supports rural areas. This scenario leads to positive developments in the rural areas, but accepts social disparities and requires the "will to strong public intervention in order to compensate for market forces".

The authors see the need for drawn-out communication processes in order to achieve social acceptance for the newly developing social conflicts in the economically prosperous metropolitan regions. Leber and Kunzmann (2006: 58) assume that the rural areas will be "the losers" of an economic policy that is almost exclusively focused on growth and is guided by the Lisbon goals. Nevertheless, the three scenarios seem somewhat exaggerated and in the case of the "pro-rural area scenario" simply unrealistic, due to the lack of available finance and the fact that acceptance for such a strategy will be hard to achieve.

The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005: 107) similarly believes that the gap between regional growth engines and shrinking or stagnating areas (including not only the most thinly populated, peripheral areas, but also parts of old industrial regions) will widen. As part of the current guiding principles realistic strategies for "stabilisation areas" are thus developed, "as for political and legal reasons Germany cannot afford to simply abandon certain areas" (Ritter 2002: 16). Different strategies have to be developed for the specific requirements of these sub-areas (ARL et al 2007: 10 f.). This applies in particular to medium-sized urban settlements and rural areas that can "expect few benefits from cooperation and themselves have hardly any growth potential". Equity-orientated intervention and the "socially negotiated notion of spatial justice" remain of importance for these areas.

However, there is considerable variation within Germany with regard to the problem of rural areas. An economically strong and for historical reasons very polycentric state such as Baden-Württemberg cannot be directly compared with states such as Brandenburg or Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Megerle 2008b). Similar differences are found in other countries. 54% of experts surveyed in Switzerland and half of those in Germany saw conflicts between strengthening the metropolitan regions and developing peripheral areas, while only 25% of experts in France perceived this conflict (Kaltenegger 2006: 102).

5.4 Changes in the subsidy structure

In connection with the new orientation of spatial planning policy there have been heated discussions about changes to subsidies at different scales. They concern estimating success rates of past subsidising policy as well as anxieties and lobbying efforts to change the current subsidising policy.

Richter (2006: 668) states that traditional regional policy in Germany has proved itself over many years and has contributed to the reduction of inequalities, while Reimer (2007a) credits the cohesion policy with having had success in "upgrading real poorhouses such as Portugal, Ireland, Emsland and Hohenlohe". In contrast, Dohnanyi and Most (2004: 15) see that even after fifteen years of subsidies the east of Germany continues to be characterised by a stagnating economy and the lack of a self-supporting economic base.¹⁹ Focused subsidies in Saxony and Thuringia show "clear success", in contrast with the "watering-can policy" of Brandenburg (John 2006: 675). A shift in the structure of subsidies is therefore justified by the need to deal effectively and efficiently with public funds (John 2006: 676), by the "devastating assessment" of the European Court and criticism of the inefficient subsidising of rural areas in Germany made by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (Kaufmann 2007: 3). Dohnanyi and Most (2004: 29) conclude that subsidies for growth centres in eastern Germany must have clear priority over subsidies for weaker regions, but only when two conditions are fulfilled. Firstly, there must be sufficient transport links to weaker regions and secondly, weaker regions must have an opportunity to define their strengths, so that new growth centres can develop in them. Furthermore, the funds to be distributed must first be created. National growth is curtailed when the state invests too little in "productive regions" as a result of redistribution. The boundary between value creation and value destruction is, economically speaking, crucial (Wegelin 2007).

Guiding Principle 1 was not developed to justify a new subsidising policy with the metropolises becoming the subsidised category and redistribution from rural regions to urban agglomerations. However, the guiding principles are intended to be considered by the various ministries when spatially relevant decisions are made, they therefore implicitly have an effect on the future distribution of investments and subsidies (Aring 2007). At the European level the funds for regional development (ERDF) in the new subsidy period, from 2007–2013 are no longer restricted to disadvantaged regions but now integrate the "urban dimension". The earlier Target 2 subsidies for the support of disadvantaged areas are now intended to support "regional competitiveness and employment" and so can also be used for metropolitan regions. However, the subsidising programme METROPOLITAN headed up by Kamal-Chaoui (2005: 215) was not known to any of the experts surveyed. Even the planning of such a programme has been ruled out (Sinz 2007).

A transnational comparison showed that 52 % of German experts think that a national subsidising policy for metropolitan regions does not exist and 28 % classify it as moderately effective. Of the Swiss experts, 38.5 % saw hardly any effect, while 15.4 % saw no effect and a further third (30.8 %) could not recognise any such subsidising policy. In France, however, 50 % of the experts classified the subsidising policy as effective, while the other 50 % thought that it had hardly any effect (Kaltenegger 2006: 97). The prospect of possible EU subsidies for metropolitan regions in the subsidy period 2007–2013 played, as to be expected, little role in Switzerland. In Germany however, experts saw a direct link to the identification of new metropolitan regions (67 %) and increased efforts to develop projects eligible for the subsidies in metropolitan regions (74 %). More than half of the experts also saw increased cooperation of political and economic actors (59 %), as well as the development of new, national strategic approaches (56 %). The different approach to metropolitan policy in

¹⁹ An additional comment is provided by the Advisory Council for Spatial Planning, which states that "In particular there are several East German regions that show that even the most comprehensive use of subsidies for more than a decade was not able to achieve it" (BMVBS 2005: 65) – referring to independent and self-supporting economic development.

France is clearly shown by the fact that 86% of the French experts surveyed saw a direct link between the development of new, national strategic approaches and the new subsidising period (Kaltenegger 2006: 102).

5.5 Metropolitan/regional governance – new management forms and new planning culture

As the territories of metropolitan regions usually do not coincide with those of political and administrative levels or regional associations, unified, administrative structures and politically legitimated institutions are mostly lacking at metropolitan level. Furthermore, in urban regions there is an ever more complicated multitude of public, private and informal approaches to cooperation between municipal institutions and sub-state and regional organisations each with varying territories, tasks and actors (DIFU 2004: 9). Behrend and Kruse (2001: 202) talk in this context of an "unspecific, not (yet) institutionalised, economical and political system" on the level of metropolitan regions, which adds a further level to the existing (federal) political system. This makes internal cooperation as well as external representation and the development of effective, national and transnational cooperation structures more difficult (Kunzmann 2002: 16). Corresponding problem complexes are not only found in Germany, but are common in other metropolitan regions. Borja and Castells (1997: 185) point out that municipalities are concerned about losing their autonomy within the metropolitan region to a higher level and that higher administrative levels are concerned about the metropolitan level being a potential rival. They also mention the increasing bureaucracy caused by a multi-level system, the need to coordinate a multitude of group interests, and the lack of democracy and sense of metropolitan identity as long as the metropolitan level is not directly elected by the citizens. Resistance against a metropolitan level can also be observed in peripheral municipalities that demonstrate stronger economic development than the core city. Jouve and Lefevre (2002: 20 f.) therefore see a need for the metropolitan level to be recognised by the EU, the nation state and the region but also suggest it should be made "relatively autonomous" of these actors. Metropolitan regions are a reference area for public activities but usually lack the appropriate legal status that would give them the required authority and a metropolitan identity.

In this context the governance approach, i.e. a culture of network cooperation between various actors and institutions, is of increased importance. With regional governance such networks can be embedded into an institutional framework to ensure, for instance, the permanence and coordination of activities. Network structures have proved to be more suitable for the mobilisation and coordination of activities as well as the participation of private actors and the execution of strategically important projects than the "limited regulatory competences of formal organisations", with the exception of prohibiting negative measures (Benz 2005: 405). However, significant differences are found between territorially and functionally oriented network cooperation. Due to the apparently important issues of autonomy and legitimisation and the legally based approach of the participating players (politicians, administrative levels), territorially oriented networks usually depend on fixed structures. Functionally oriented networks, which are usually associated with the competition-oriented activities of companies, tend rather to be based on loose cooperation (Fürst 2005: 712). A successful linking of functional and territorial governance systems is an important characteristic of successful regions (Fürst 2008: 225). According to Priebs (2002), the most promising approaches are those where the "strategic level of governance" is a "public-law core", e.g. in the form of an association that is able to efficiently manage the operational units and at the same time to establish a supplementary network system of regional institutions. The

support of the regional networks through political representatives in the municipalities, in particular through the mayors is particularly important (Steinberg 2003: 107). A problem of regional governance that is particularly relevant in the complex multi-level systems of metropolitan regions is the fact that the participating players usually represent territories and thus tend to neglect the interests of the total area, for which they feel less responsible. Interweaving of multiple levels involves the risk of sub-optimal compromises and the exclusion of crucial topics even to the point of decision-blocking, in particular by actors with an imperative mandate from their organisation who thus do not have sufficient freedom to negotiate (Feil 2005: 19 f.). Regional governance based on voluntarism therefore has a strong tendency towards a less critical project orientation, which then does not lead to the changes intended.

The governance approach shows that successful management of spatial development not only requires the cooperation of the main actors (including academic and cultural institutions and economic enterprises), functional decision-making bodies, a management centre and structured, motivated cooperation with a "one-voice policy" (Ludwig et al 2008: 186). It also requires rules for financial redistribution and other compensation mechanisms (Benz 2005: 407). This aspect is particularly explosive, as supra-regional prestige projects lead to a spatially uneven distribution of costs and burdens and therefore to an "intensification of intra-regional distribution conflicts". In addition, growth-oriented areas of politics compete with more inward-facing, preservation-oriented social spatial activities (ARL et al 2007: 7). Benz points out that considerable research will be required in this area to improve spatial planning and regional political control. This also applies to the large-scale cooperative structures of the communities of responsibility, for which Blatter (2008: 32) sees problems arising out of a lack of commonalities that could lead to a destabilisation of the structures of metropolitan governance for the inner agglomeration area.

Guiding Principle 1 "Growth and innovation" is to provide stimuli for regional governance, i.e. better self-organisation. The arrangement of acknowledged metropolitan regions according to their specific organisational structure is intended to achieve "deliberate variety in the competition about successful guiding principles for the self-organisation of urban regions" (MKRO 2006: 708). The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning is currently working on guidelines for regional governance (Lutter 2007). However, it seems clear that a standardised model would be neither useful nor feasible, as each metropolitan region differs in terms of spatial, legal and administrative framework conditions and the specific challenges it faces (BMBVS 207a: 5). Eleven different governance approaches are therefore currently to be found in German metropolitan regions (Ludwig et al 2008: 183), in spite of the concerns of Blatter (2008: 34) that the metropolitan region concept would lead to an "entrenching of performative management" and thus to a homogenisation of metropolitan governance.

5.5.1 Institutional restructuring

The problems that German metropolitan regions have in attaining the ability to act both externally and internally is largely due to their comparatively weak institutionalisation (BBR 2002: 127), as well as to the lack of interest of the German administrative culture in integrated, interdisciplinary planning (John 2006: 676). In order to reveal the full strengths of the metropolitan regions "institutional restructuring of these regions" would be required (Adam et al 2005: 418). However, this can pose a considerable political risk (Jouve 2003: 40). The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005: 188) thus sees a need not only for creating the appropriate organisational, institutional and financial structures, but also for a democratic legitimisation of this new level in

order to provide a political safeguard that will allow the residents to identify with the metropolitan region. The competences of this regional level would have to considerably exceed those of the previous regional institutions and include strategy development, coordination and management of regionally important projects, provision of infrastructure, the internal and external representation of regional interests and international marketing. The Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL et al 2007: 7) and Blotevogel (2005c: 646) call for a responsible and legitimised player for a strategic development policy as well as competent representation in global networks. The Advisory Council for Spatial Planning sees "reform of the planning hierarchy" and trimming of the administration as necessary to facilitate the establishment of democratically legitimised and financially feasible units for regional planning in increasingly regionalised living and economic spaces. These units for regional planning should be able to provide active support for growth, also in metropolitan regions (BMVBS 2005: 13 f.). Such units are further necessary when conflicts of interests require a "hard decision, i.e. clear, hierarchical, legally binding regulatory planning". Cooperative planning approaches can reach their limits in such situations in planning practice. "Appropriate interconnections between cooperative and hierarchical planning approaches" are therefore required to be able, on the one hand, to push decisions through and, on the other hand, to improve acceptance by accompanying, cooperative approaches ("cooperation in the shade of hierarchy") (BMVBS 2005: 64 f.). With regard to the "political and planning structure of urban agglomerations on a regional level" the Advisory Council for Spatial Planning emphasised the importance of organisational forms such as a regional parliament that is able to act for the region in an authorised and at times legally binding manner to ensure that "the safeguarding of the functions of the centres is optimally organised". Such institutions could also handle the "problem of discrepancy between those who use infrastructure and those who pay for it" through financial redistribution of benefits and burdens (BMVBS 2005: 68). They could also deal with issues that concern more than one municipality and that would otherwise be handled in informal negotiations, in a grey zone outside public control (BMVBS 2005: 72).

II Implementation in south-western Germany

The situation in Baden-Württemberg with regard to metropolitan regions has many facets (Map 2). Centrally located is the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, which – as the oldest of the metropolitan regions – was designated as early as 1995 in the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities published by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Chapter 6). The more recent Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region crosses federal state boundaries and received metropolitan region status in 2005, along with three other candidates (Chapter 7). The trinational Upper Rhine region can be seen as a potential metropolitan region (Chapter 8.1). The Strasbourg-Ortenau Eurodistrict is not an accredited metropolitan region in Germany but is in France, where the German Ortenau district is included in the metropolitan region (Chapter 8.2). The two Swiss metropolitan regions of Basel and Zurich are located so close to the border that their catchment areas also include parts of southern Baden-Württemberg (Chapter 8.3).

In addition, Baden-Württemberg has several dynamic growth engines outside the metropolitan regions, i. e. the Lake Constance cross-border European catchment area and the areas around Freiburg im Breisgau and Ulm (Chapter 8.4), whereby Freiburg is part of the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region. As may be seen from Map 2, this leaves only relatively small areas outside metropolitan regions, e. g. the Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg regional association, a situation that is even more noticeable after the extension of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart.


A cartographic representation of the locations of metropolitan functions and the extended metropolitan catchment area based on ongoing observation by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (Einig et al. 2006: 624) allocates almost the entire area of Baden-Württemberg to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart; with some areas in the west of the state being allocated to the Upper Rhine centres of Mannheim, Karlsruhe and Freiburg.

The metropolitan region concept and its implementation have attracted much attention in Baden-Württemberg (Baumgartner 2007), which has led to intense discussions about the "correct form" of implementation in planning practice. However, bearing in mind the characteristics of the state described below, Scheffold (2007) queries whether the metropolitan region approach is at all suitable for Baden-Württemberg.

Overall, Baden-Württemberg has a very strong economy. The current innovation indicator for Germany (BDI 2006: 79 f.) shows excellent potential, especially with regard to high tech, and research and development. With a patent registration quota of 600 per million residents, Baden-Württemberg is the European leader. The Stuttgart conurbation and the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia/Ulm region are regarded as high-innovation areas.

Due to its historical development Baden-Württemberg is a polycentric region with dynamic economic clusters that are not confined to the conurbations. Rural economic clusters such as Tuttlingen (medical technology), Furtwangen (precision mechanics) or Biberach (pharmaceuticals) in some cases have higher growth rates than many conurbations. Baden-Württemberg is one of the few German states with no official "stabilisation areas", i. e. areas with below average economic development, declining population and a lack of job opportunities. Apart from Schleswig-Holstein, Baden-Württemberg is also the only German state in which the current Prognos study did not identify a region seen to be at risk in the future. Only areas lacking connections to major transportation networks (e. g. Sigmaringen) do less well in the various rankings, but they still mostly achieve ranks clearly above the national average.

Map 2: Current situation of metropolitan regions in Baden-Württemberg
(Megerle 2007:46)



Krätke's (2005: 178) investigation into regional economic centres with strong cluster potential in knowledge-intensive activities showed values with a positive deviation from the mean for most of the districts in Baden-Württemberg, including numerous districts outside the recognised metropolitan regions, such as the Lake Constance district, the Konstanz District, and almost all districts along the Upper Rhine axis. As a result of its

good positioning in international markets and high export diversification, Baden-Württemberg sees globalisation as bringing new opportunities, especially in research-intensive industries and knowledge-intensive services (Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg 2005: 3). This was confirmed by the latest economic report (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007). Thus it is not only economic performance that remains high – of 44 districts, 36 had an above average rating – but regional variation was also comparatively low. No general spatial pattern could be found for the development of economic performance between 1996 and 2004, nor could performance be linked to settlement structure. The main industries characterised by strong growth are information and knowledge-based services, electrical technology, automotive, chemical products and health and social services. The latter play a special role, as they are not spatially concentrated and so stabilise regional economic growth. On the other hand, the automotive industry is traditionally concentrated in conurbations, and information and knowledge-based services show an increasing tendency to cluster in urban agglomeration areas.

When a map of the metropolitan regions is overlaid with a map of economic growth from 2001–2004, both accredited and potential metropolitan regions can be clearly recognised. There was an above-average increase in the regions of Stuttgart, Rhine/Neckar, Central and Southern Upper Rhine, as well as Lake Constance/Upper Swabia (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007: 29). During the 1997–2000 period there was also an above average increase in the regions Heilbronn-Franken, Donau/Iller, Upper Rhine/Lake Constance, as well as Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg, i.e. regions with a relatively high proportion of rural space (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007: 26). Despite the current balance of regional economic activities, there are doubts as to whether the regions far from urban agglomerations will be able to find a role in the process of transformation into a knowledge-based society and economy. For these rather rural regions it may become "increasingly difficult to create good preconditions for economic growth" (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007: 12).

Table 3: Categorisation of the urban agglomerations of Stuttgart, Mannheim and Strasbourg in various studies

| Study | Stuttgart | Mannheim | Strasbourg |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| Krätke 2007 | Established centre with knowledge- intensive industries | Established centre with knowledge-intensive industries and services | Established centre with knowledge- intensive industries |
| Paal 2005 | Regional metropolis of international significance | Not listed | Internationally specialised metropolis |
| Cicille, Rozenblatt 2003 | Category 5, i.e. at least one function of European significance. | Category 7, i.e. no factor of European significance | Category 5, i.e. at least one function of European significance. |
| ESPON 2005 | MEGA Category 1 | Not listed | Not listed |
| Prognos 2007 | For Stuttgart: very good future opportunities; for adjoining districts: good opportunities to balanced mix of opportunities and risks. | For Heidelberg: very good future opportunities; remainder: good future opportunities. | Ortenau district: balanced mix of opportunities and risks. |
| Kaltenegger 2006 | Mainly of European, but to a lesser extent also of national and international significance | Mainly of national, but to a lesser extent also of regional and European significance | Of European, national and regional significance |

6 The European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (EMRS)²⁰

The information provided in the following chapter is largely based on the comprehensive survey conducted among the municipalities and on expert interviews (Chapter 1). The survey results were correlated with spatial categories, membership of regional associations, size of municipalities as well as their position within or outside the metropolitan region (borders according to the 2002 State Development Plan). Some of the surveys were conducted at a very early stage (May 2006), a fact that must be borne in mind when considering the results, including the low level of knowledge and at times rather negative attitude of some municipalities. Due to the dynamic nature of developments, a later survey may well have yielded slightly different results. To supplement the survey and to integrate current development processes, the members of the regional assembly of the Stuttgart Regional Association (Verband Region Stuttgart: VRS) were therefore questioned in April 2008 and several other interviews were conducted with experts. A survey conducted among key actors of the VRS by the Stuttgart Regional Forum in the summer of 2006 has unfortunately been neither made available nor published (Schmid 2006 and 2007).

As the University of Tübingen lies within the territory of the Stuttgart Metropolitan Region there were opportunities for participatory observation, for instance at sessions of the steering committee. The discussions that took place within this forum provided a great deal of information on the day-to-day business of implementing the metropolitan region and made it possible to get to know all important key actors. In addition, several of these actors made possible the viewing of unpublished minutes of meetings, etc., which provided valuable supplementary information.

6.1 The current situation in the metropolitan region

The Stuttgart region with its core city of Stuttgart and the surrounding five districts of Rems-Murr, Ludwigsburg, Böblingen, Esslingen and Göppingen is not only geographically the largest, but with just under 2.6 million residents and 1.26 million employed persons, it is the most densely populated and economically strongest region in Baden-Württemberg, as well as one of the most developed regions of the European Union (Gaebe 2003: 81). There are very close interconnections with the nearby regional centres of Tübingen, Reutlingen and Heilbronn.

Since industrialisation, the Stuttgart area has been a most important and prosperous industrial region. The economic strength and competitiveness of the region is largely based on the automotive industry and mechanical and electrical engineering. Stuttgart is therefore one of the regions that Krätke (2007) categorised as path and profile type 1, i.e. strongly influenced by knowledge-intensive industries (Table 3). Much of the potential of the Stuttgart region is in the technology field. A current study (cited by Müller 2007) lists Stuttgart and its surroundings as Europe's top technology region. More than 400 000 people are employed in high-tech companies. This is the equivalent of 21 % of all employees, a European record. There is also a positive correlation with patent registrations, which were three times as high as the European Union average. In a European comparison the Stuttgart region was seen to come second only to Paris and its surroundings in terms of high-tech concentration (Müller 2007). At 40 %, the export rate is very high, which on the one hand is an expression of high international competitiveness and integration into global trade relations, but on the other hand indicates a high risk factor due to dependence on international economic cycles (Gaebe 1997: 9).

²⁰ Abbreviation used in the rest of the text.

Even today, the Stuttgart region is still characterised by a very high percentage of workers in the secondary sector (47.6%) and a relatively small percentage in the tertiary sector (51.7%).

In recent years new challenges have questioned the continued success of this development path. On the one hand there has been poor growth in the deindustrialisation process due to the specific industrial structure, which leads Krätke (2007) to classify the regional effect as strongly negative in relation to high-tech industries. Changes in competitive structure resulting from globalisation have, among other things, led to the disappearance of 130.000 jobs in production (Schuster 2006b). According to Gaebe (2003: 82), the strongest economic region of the country is no longer the most prosperous and has stopped acting as a growth engine.

On the other hand, the spatial concentration of highly developed investment and consumer goods industries in combination with the corresponding business services provides sophisticated conditions with which to meet the pending challenges (Hahn 1997: 72). Krätke (2007: 101) therefore found positive regional effects among medium high-tech industries and technology-related services. Stuttgart is one of the European regions where research-intensive industries join knowledge-intensive services to form an integral part of structural change towards a knowledge economy. Krätke (2007: 141 f.) thus sees a relevant strategic point of departure for regional economic development policy in the active maintenance and promotion of industrial potential. In the current Prognos "Atlas of the Future", the core metropolis is classified as having "top future opportunities", the adjoining districts of Böblingen, Ludwigsburg and Heilbronn as having very good opportunities and the districts of Esslingen and Tübingen as having good future opportunities (Prognos 2007).

Both in 1997 and in 2003, Gaebe (1997: 26 f.; 2003: 88) believed that the Stuttgart region did not display the "guideline characteristics" for European Metropolitan Regions. In his view the Stuttgart region either did not fulfil or fulfilled minimally criteria such as "international visibility, world city level, convenient location within the European transport and communication networks, international functions and institutions". The only criteria Gaebe sees as fulfilled are "population size and density, economic strength and significance in export trade" and he draws the conclusion that "Stuttgart does not come close to having the locational quality of a European Metropolitan Region". Comparable statements were made by the municipalities surveyed.²¹

The decision-making and control functions of a metropolitan region are, however, clearly fulfilled by the factors discussed above, and supplemented by the presence of the headquarters of internationally active companies (Daimler, Porsche, Bosch, etc.) and the seat of the state government. This also applies to the innovative and competitive functions. The region has 19 universities and is a leader in Germany with regard to expenditure on research and patent registrations (Baumann 2006: 2). Indeed, with 876.4 patent registrations per million residents the region takes second place within Europe (Baden-Württemberg statistical monthlies, No. 7/2005: 9).

The gateway function is currently a weak point, both within the region and externally. The spatial settlement structure of this region results in "mad transport interconnections" internally, with many "links in all directions" (DIFU 2004: 25 f.). Among the measures being discussed is the completion of a ring road around Stuttgart with a north-

²¹ "I find that the Stuttgart area is completely over-valued with the term metropolitan region" (Ebhausen); "What is the normative basis for the definition of the term metropolitan region? Is this supposed to mean Stuttgart + surroundings = New York, Tokyo or Beijing?" (Niederstotzingen).

east axis. An improvement in international connections is to be achieved, for instance, by integration into the trans-European Paris-Budapest link. The main project in this regard is the comprehensive but strongly disputed conversion of Stuttgart's main railway station, as well as the redesign of the area north of the railway station, which will be cleared during redevelopment (Stuttgart 21). An end was put to the equally controversial discussion surrounding the proposed extension of Stuttgart airport when, in June 2008, the governor of the federal state decided against it. The indicators for metropolitan functions are thus clearly fulfilled by the metropolitan core, but not by the now much extended region, which includes areas with a negative growth contribution (according to Einig (2006: 625), parts of the Main-Tauber district), as well as some very thinly populated districts.

In an Allensbach survey, economic actors named the following locational risks for the Stuttgart region: mobility and traffic jams (27 %),²² high salary costs (24 %) and a lack of skilled labour (16 %) (Steinacher 2004). Similar observations were made at the forum on "Regional Development Perspectives" held on 24/07/2008.

6.2 New orientation of regional planning – the Verband Region Stuttgart (VRS)²³

Ever since the establishment of the Stuttgart neighbourhood association following the regional reforms of the early 1970s, cooperation between municipalities has been a "constant topic of discussion" in the Stuttgart region. This is mainly based on strong intraregional functional networks and on an increasing discrepancy between the existing, small scale political-administrative structures and the requirements and spatial catchment areas of specific plans and large-scale projects of the export dependent Stuttgart region (DIFU 2004: 23).

At the beginning of the 1990s, the existing administrative structures and the form of political representation were the main reasons for the fragmented political structures and intense competition between the municipalities (Wolfram 2004: 80). To achieve the restructuring goals of regional policy, these deficits in inter-municipality cooperation and the lack of significance of the regional level had to be overcome (Iwer et al 2002: 65). After a long phase of economic prosperity, the economic crisis of the early 1990s clearly increased the pressure to take action. The Stuttgart neighbourhood association was unable to solve the problems at hand owing to its lack of decision-making power and the fact that it existed in parallel to the regional association, albeit with a different delimitation (DIFU 2004: 32). The establishment by the state government of a consultative committee for EC issues in 1989 and the first Stuttgart Regional Conference held in 1991 resulted in municipal cooperation during the 1992/1993 period, for example the establishment of a marketing and tourism organisation for the region (Regio Stuttgart Marketing- und Tourismus GmbH). In February 1994 the law "Strengthening cooperation in the Stuttgart region" was used to create an association for the area: the Verband Region Stuttgart (VRS). The aim of the association was to improve the position of the Stuttgart region in European and international competition, and to ensure for the core area the possibility of acting as a region.²⁴ Proposals for the establishment of a regional district to act as a strong counterweight to the core city proved unsuccessful in 1994

²² According to the calculations of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce traffic jams and tailbacks result in costs of more than 300 million €/year (Baumann 2006: 4).

²³ Abbreviation to be used in the text to follow.

²⁴ According to Reiss-Schmidt (2003: 77), it was only possible for this law to be passed due to the political configuration of the time: a grand coalition was governing the federal state.

(Gaebe 1997: 27); similarly reforms aimed at incorporating independent municipalities failed because of constitutional and political issues. The alternative of voluntary cooperation in the form of special-purpose associations did not appear adequate, as it was difficult to secure financing on a voluntary basis and because intervention in the planning authority of a municipality is not possible without a legal basis (Schuster 2006: 110).

In contrast to the "traditional" regional associations, the VRS was one of the few multiple-purpose municipal associations in the large German agglomerations to take on duties in addition to regional planning. This included regional traffic planning, the sponsorship and coordination of regionally significant economic financing and regional tourism marketing, along with regional management tasks such as networking, process management and implementation guidance. The inter-municipal land-use planning carried out by the neighbourhood association, on the other hand, was not taken over by the VRS "due to resistance among municipalities in the Stuttgart hinterland" (DIFU 2004: 34). It does, however, deal with tasks that affect the whole region but that form part of the competence sphere of the municipalities, such as locational development and promotion of the economy. As the population directly elects the members of the regional parliament, the VRS is directly democratically legitimised. The establishment of the VRS created an institutionalised regional political level that was much more focused on actions and possessed a far higher potential for managing regional development than the "classical" regional associations (Iwer et al 2002: 69 f.). In its analysis, the German Institute of Urban Affairs (DIFU 2004: 38) sees the association as representing "an advantage for the region that should not be underestimated". However, the association's structure has caused disputes with the municipalities about who possessed the ultimate planning authority and about levy-based financing, as well as friction with the districts about the division of tasks (Schuster 2006: 110). It is, in particular, the clear increase in share of costs and the lack of a clear division of tasks between, for instance, the districts and the VRS, that caused Schuler (2006) to suggest that the VRS constitutes a "weakening of the region". Despite successful implementation, the VRS therefore sees itself as confronted by deeply rooted municipal sectionalism with conflicts about ultimate authority and constant legitimisation pressure (Iwer et al 2002: 33). In addition criticism has been directed at the rather low ability of the VRS to implement concrete planning decisions, and its spatial delimitation, which increasingly fails to reflect current economic networks and the tasks at hand (DIFU 2004: 40). Kamal-Chaoui (2005: 213) traces the low institutional, political and fiscal potential of the VRS in comparison with other state institutions to the fact that strong metropolises²⁵ generally constitute a political threat for the state, hindering it, for instance, in its role as guarantor of equal living conditions.

Nevertheless the Stuttgart region is today regarded as an "example of a highly developed regional association" (Prieps 2005: 1102) and, along with the Hannover region, as representing a national and international benchmark in relation to the new orientation of regional planning and regional cooperation (Raumordnungsverband Rhein/Neckar 2005: 20, Kamal-Chaoui 2005, Jouve and Lefèvre 2005: 24), as well as a prototype of the new regional policy (Iwer et al 2002: 92). Blotevogel (2005c: 646) classifies the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart as one of the few in which a "capable form of organisation at regional level" has been established and where state and municipal policy has been orientated towards the "metropolitan functions of the metropolitan region in a suitable manner". Kujath and von Schlippenbach (2001: 7 ff.) agree that the VRS is a

²⁵ Kamal-Chaoui (2005: 213) mentions Stuttgart along with London and Montreal in this context.

regional association solution that establishes a formal power to act and that represents the "functional restructuring of the metropolitan region". The regional association created a formal "organising capacity" around a strong centre. Kujath and von Schlippenbach further believe that the "organisational reinforcement of the region" is also expressed in the establishment of regionally rooted companies such as the Region Economic Development Corporation, tourism marketing, exhibition companies, etc. Jouve (2003: 40) classifies the VRS as a new generation of metropolitan institutions.

The Stuttgart Region Economic Development Corporation (WRS) was established in August 1995. This is intended to provide the administratively fragmented region with a central point of contact and so to end the now obsolete competition between the 179 municipalities and the associated weakening of the locational competitiveness of the entire region. The VRS and the WRS have provided "important institutional positioning" (Iwer et al 2002: 10), the timing of which corresponded with initial attempts to reorientate spatial policy at national level and the designation of the first European metropolitan regions by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Wolfram 2004: 91).

6.3 Expectations for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

In 1995 the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart was one of the first six European metropolitan regions to be mentioned in the Spatial Policy Framework. According to Schulze (2006) however, the integration of Stuttgart at that time took place under protest.


The Baden-Württemberg Ministry for Economic Affairs regards the further development of the EMRS as a significant contribution towards the sustainability of the entire federal state (Bullinger 2005: 2). The general expectations of the municipalities are also mainly linked to business development and growth promotion, as well as to better international competitiveness. The relatively high ratings given for improved regional cooperation are noteworthy, especially because this issue is regarded particularly critically by municipalities in the fringe areas of the regional associations (Chapter 6.9). High ratings were also given to the image of the region (Chapter 6.8). In comparison with the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, it is surprising how many municipalities had no expectations – especially municipalities that felt inadequately informed at the time of the survey – or explicitly expressed negative expectations (especially the strengthening of the urban agglomerations at the expense of the rural areas, increased bureaucracy, an "entrainment" effect and "paper tigers"). Closely related to this is the fact that many municipalities expect few or no advantages for themselves from the EMRS. Although rural and smaller municipalities more rarely expected to benefit than larger municipalities in the agglomeration area,²⁶ even larger municipalities within the EMRS are very sceptical about the metropolitan region²⁷. Unlike in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, in the EMRS several direct rejections were expressed.²⁸

²⁶ "... will push the rural areas even further into the background. The goal of achieving equal living conditions has moved into the far distance" (Königheim).

²⁷ "An antiquated concept. It contributes little towards solving present and future challenges" (Leonberg).


²⁸ "I am a committed opponent of the metropolitan region" (Kaisersbach); "Best to leave it alone" (Langenbrettach).

Figure 1: Assessment of expected advantages and general expectations of the municipalities (author's diagram)



The majority of municipalities saw the concept of metropolitan regions to be well suited for stimulating economic growth, successfully dealing with globalisation effects and accelerating European integration (Figure 2). On the other hand, the concept is regarded as less suitable for promoting nature conservation and environmental protection, for guaranteeing sustainable development and for coping with the consequences of demographic change. All the larger urban settlements but only half the smaller ones agreed on the point "stimulating economic growth". There was also a clear higher level of agreement within the agglomeration area and its fringe, as opposed to the rural areas.

Figure 2: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept by the regional assembly and the municipalities (author's diagram)



The general expectations of members of the regional assembly focused on increasing locational competitiveness, followed at some distance by improving cooperation and the image of the location. In many cases, the question of expected subsidies was also raised. In one case the metropolitan region was also linked to the acknowledgement by the state government of the special regional problems experienced within the Stuttgart agglomeration, as well as with a decrease in the competitive attitude of Stuttgart in relation to the remainder of Baden-Württemberg. Surprisingly, two members had no expectations and a further two had only very low expectations.

The regional assembly regards the metropolitan region concept as being well suited for promoting economic growth and furthering cooperation across various planning levels. Surprisingly, contribution towards European integration received the poorest assessment, coming even after promotion of nature conservation and environmental protection.

6.4 The discussion process regarding the problem of delimitation

Unlike the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Chapter 7.2.5), the delimitation of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart was the subject of long, intensive discussions.


The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning did not clearly delimit the metropolitan regions in 1995, but intentionally left them vague. The 1995 cartographic representation did, however, show the regional centres of Tübingen, Reutlingen and Heilbronn on the borders of the metropolitan region in such a way as to suggest their integration.

The 2002 State Development Plan of Baden-Württemberg lay out spatial delimitations to the Stuttgart agglomeration and the areas around Heilbronn and Tübingen/Reutlingen, as well as their fringes. The state government thus determined that the prosperous adjoining regions would have to be involved (Landtag Baden-Württemberg 2006: 152) and by so doing outlined the planning and action space within which activities related to the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart were to occur, but avoided any clear delimitation that would "either oblige or exclude" municipalities. An orientation on the agglomeration and its fringes seemed, however, to be "indispensable" (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: B63). According to Paragraph 6.2.2, the EMR of Stuttgart is to be based on spatial and organisational decentrality. Networking with other parts of the federal state is to optimise interaction between the development goals of the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and the other regions of the state, especially the adjoining regions (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: 44).

The external presentation of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart was identical to that of the Stuttgart Regional Association (VRS) for a long time (see, among others, KoRis 2004: 46 ff.; Blotevogel 2006b: 11 ff.). Blotevogel (2006b: 11) doubted, however, that the relatively narrowly delimited region would be sufficient "for the large-scale cooperation approach of metropolitan regions".

In the early years, the metropolitan region of Stuttgart was directed by the VRS. The spatial delimitation was thus focused on the 179 member municipalities. The area covered by the VRS is, however, not the same as the agglomeration of the 2002 State Development Plan; it includes a total of 23 municipalities in the districts of Esslingen, Rems-Murr and Göppingen that belong to the rural spatial category and so are not included as an integral part of the metropolitan region by the state development plan. However, in 2006 the regional assembly of the VRS stated that the "Stuttgart region, including its rural areas ... forms the core region of the European metropolitan region". The VRS favoured a metropolitan region with an adjoining community of responsibility, as a certain minimum of cohesion, e. g. through commuter interconnections, was regarded as essential (Steinacher 2008). Furthermore it seems impossible to provide the necessary capacity for action and the wished for visibility in an overblown region that ignores the variety within (Ludwig 2006). The VRS (2006a: 10) regarded a debate "about the correct spatial delimitation of the Stuttgart region" as not useful.

Map 3: EMRS and the extension of its borders



6.4.1 Expansion of the metropolitan region

The Neckar/Alb regional association (2007: 10), which also includes the dual regional centres of Reutlingen and Tübingen, has long demanded the better integration of these areas into the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, arguing that the "concept of the European metropolitan regions makes possible the distribution and networking of spatial functions on a regional scale", but that "the aim is not a focus on one specific centre". Therefore during the first meeting initiated by the lord mayor of Stuttgart on

29.05.2005 it was decided that "no regions that by virtue of their 'sociocultural' inter-connections belong to the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart should be excluded. The transitions were regarded as seamless and extending beyond the core zones (the agglomeration and its fringes) of the 2002 State Development Plan. The plan can thus only serve as an initial orientation point" (Regionalverband Neckar/Alb 2006: 3).

Although the draft of the regional development concept still referred to a core region (VRS) with an adjoining cooperation area (four neighbouring regional associations) and to "partners" with whom a project could be undertaken, the meeting of the steering committee held on 26.09.2006 discussed the "official" expansion of the region by integrating the adjoining regional associations. Fears that implementation of the Lisbon strategy could mean EU subsidies being transferred to the growth engines had resulted in a high level of interest from "fringe zones" that feared being excluded from subsidy programmes.²⁹ In the Neckar/Alb regional association a corresponding decision was already made in the regional forum in the autumn of 2005. In the current regional plan of the Heilbronn/Franken regional association (Public Announcement July 2006) affiliation was restricted to the "immediate area around Heilbronn". The entire region was encouraged to "make impulses fruitful so that positive effects can be achieved in as many sub-regions as possible" (Regionalverband Heilbronn-Franken 2006: 17). A corresponding application for the integration of the entire regional association area was submitted at a later stage, although the regional director suggested a "stepped version" comparable to the Zurich metropolitan region, on the basis of the different intensities of interconnections and flows (Hein 26.09.2007). The regional director of the Northern Black Forest regional association was at this time in favour of intensive cooperation, an opinion that was based on a political decision to look towards Stuttgart rather than towards the Rhine axis. He did not, however, favour a concrete delimitation, as a structure including all five regional associations would be too large (Kück 26.09.2006). The lord mayor of Stuttgart concurred on the latter point at this time.³⁰

Pforzheim and the Enz district (being part of the Northern Black Forest regional association) are seen by the potential metropolitan region of Upper Rhine as being "in a central position", which could perhaps form an area of overlap (Hager 2007). This interpretation corresponds to the current state development plan, which in Paragraph 6.2.3.2 sums up the Karlsruhe/Pforzheim area as having a "bridging function to Rhineland-Palatinate and France on the one hand and to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart on the other hand", thus stressing the special importance of the area for the development of the Upper Rhine European catchment area (Chapter 8.1) (Wirtschaftsministerium 2002: 47). The East Württemberg regional association, for which the state development plan foresaw only an "intensification of cooperation" with the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: B67), decided to integrate its entire region into the cooperation area of the metropolitan region (Eble 2008).

During the meeting of the steering committee held in Stuttgart on 23 April 2007, the official incorporation of the total area of all five regional associations was decided upon. The alternatives were unacceptable because any "predetermined breaking point" within a regional association would result in the "provincial region" being left behind, something that regional policy aims to avoid (Hein 2007), and because exclusion of

²⁹ "It appears to make sense to be part of it, as the EU will probably especially sponsor the further development of the metropolitan regions in future" (Hardthausen).

³⁰ "Beyond the State Development Plan, but all five regional associations are too large, we lose sight of one another" (Schuster 26/09/2006).

parts of the region could not be advocated (Eble 2008). Map 3 shows the current delimitation of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. The extension leads to the sharing of boundaries with the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region in the west and north-west and with the Nürnberg metropolitan region in the east.

Table 4: Municipalities and spatial categories according to the 2002 State Development Plan

| Spatial categories | Stuttgart | Heilbronn/ Franken | Neckar/ Alb | East Würt- temberg | Northern Black Forest | Total |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Urban agglomeration | 118 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 144 |
| Fringe of urban agglomeration | 38 | 22 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 93 |
| Urban settlement in rural area | 0 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 29 |
| Rural area | 23 | 69 | 33 | 31 | 28 | 184 |
| Total number of municipalities | 179 | 111 | 67 | 53 | 40 | 450 |
| Within EMRS according to 2002 State Development Plan | 156 87 % | 34 31 % | 26 39 % | 9 17 % | 12 30 % | 237 53 % |

As may be seen from Table 4, only just over half of the municipalities (53 %) are part of the EMRS according to the original delimitation. When applied to the individual regional associations, this amounts to a maximum of 87 % for the VRS and a minimum of 17 % in East Württemberg.

As the steering committee initiated by the lord mayor of Stuttgart was not democratically legitimised and as its decisions are therefore not legally binding, as well as in view of the governance problems mentioned in Chapter 6.5, the discussions about delimitation are far from over. Thus, for example, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (BMVBS 2007: 31) uses the 2002 State Development Plan as a basis for the delimitations of the adjoining urban agglomerations, but includes the entire Stuttgart region (BMVBS 2007a: 44 f.),³¹ similar to the annual report of the Stuttgart regional forum (2007: 31) and in line with the presentation of the regional director of the VRS (Steinacher 2007b) at the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL) conference in Hamburg. However, on the other hand the map of the metropolitan regions produced by the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany (BMVBS 2007a: 31) shows the expanded region, including the adjoining regional associations. The former chief planner of the VRS, Vallée (2007), favoured a consortium with the adjoining regional associations instead of a Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart that integrates one third of the area of Baden-Württemberg and half of its population. In the Neckar/Alb region, the metropolitan region is still regarded as too "Stuttgart-orientated" (Kreibich 2006: 23).

A change in the spatial delimitation of the area of the VRS is also being considered. Options include narrowing down the area to that of the agglomeration, and increasing it to an area similar to that of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart as laid out in the state

³¹ The regional director of the VRS, Steinacher, is the head of the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany which submitted this publication.

development plan (DIFU 2004: 43).³² The latter can be expected to encounter considerable resistance.


Discussions about regional delimitation and responsibilities are equally apparent in the present process of updating the regional plans. According to the VRS draft, the entire region, including the rural areas, are designated as the core of the EMRS, with a total delimitation similar to that of the 2002 State Development Plan. The functions of the metropolitan region are to be shored up and extended in coordination and cooperation with the adjoining areas (VRS 2008: 4). By contrast, the Neckar/Alb regional association (2007: 2 ff.) consistently emphasises the integration of the entire region and stresses the opportunities resulting from its position within the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, while at the same time talking about "strengthening the autonomy" of the region.³³

Only implementation in practice can show whether and to what extent the delimitation of the metropolitan region will work. However, there are already problems with external representation, financing, etc. (Chapter 6.5 and Chapter 6.7).

6.4.2 Assessments by the municipalities

The possible delimitation of the metropolitan region was also very controversial among the municipalities. Their assessments regarding a clear delimitation versus flexible geometries and a large-scale versus small-scale region are not nearly as clear-cut as in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Chapter 7.2.5).

Figure 3: Degree of acceptance for a network structure and endorsement of a clear territorial delimitation (author's diagram)



A slight majority of the municipalities (52%) is in favour of clear territorial delimitation, mainly in order to have clear structures and regulations,³⁴ particularly with regard to financing issues. Some 41 % do not regard this as necessary³⁵ or even fear that

³² The region should actually be differently delimited, i.e. Tübingen and Reutlingen should be included (Lord Mayor Heinrich, city of Nürtingen at the podium discussion on the second day of planning at the Nürtingen/Geisingen University of Economics and the Environment on 29/06/2007).

³³ The goal that was set was that the Neckar/Alb region should be an "equal partner within the network of the European metropolitan region". On the one hand, the "locational benefits of the Stuttgart economic region should be utilised, on the other hand autonomous regional development should be striven for" (Neckar/Alb regional association 2007: 8).

³⁴ "To have a clear structure in case of any rights to participation and involvement" (Bönnigheim).

³⁵ "Economic links also do not recognise clear spatial delimitations" (Besigheim).

it might be disadvantageous,³⁶ while 3% see both advantages and disadvantages and 4% gave no response to this question. A correlation analysis with the size of the community and its position showed that municipalities within the EMRS core area tended to favour a clear territorial delimitation more than municipalities in the fringes (Figure 3). This became particularly clear when correlated with the regional layout according to the state development plan. Municipalities that according to this plan were outside the metropolitan region more frequently reject the option of clear territorial delimitation, probably because they fear that such delimitation could be disadvantageous, perhaps leading to their exclusion. Proponents of clear delimitation mostly emphasise the importance of an uniform external image and the problem of managing too large an area,³⁷ whereas their opponents are in favour of large-scale, broad integration.³⁸

In contrast to the representatives of the regional associations, not all municipalities regarded it as necessary to integrate all the regional associations in their entirety. For instance the mayor of the Neckar/Alb city Bad Urach regarded the Albtrauf as the border, on the basis of the cultural and industrial break that was apparent here (Ewald 2007). Critical comments were also received from several Alb municipalities and from municipalities in the rural district of Hohenlohe.

In some cases there were also links between the form of the delimitation and the general comprehensibility of the concept. Thus the municipality of Mönsheim³⁹ sees a contradiction between their "rigid spatial planning allocation" to the Karlsruhe district and possible membership of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart.

The delimitation problem was at times approached with considerable sophistication, for example it was argued that the delimitation of a core region was essential, but that this core region should be open in terms of it being possible at any time to redefine its external boundary according to the nature of the project at hand.⁴⁰ It was also suggested that the dynamics of the metropolitan region may necessitate flexible adaptation.

Two-thirds (66%) of the municipalities are in favour of large-scale delimitation, which would also include large parts of the rural areas. More than half (53%) saw a risk in the exclusion of areas, while 80% saw opportunities in the greater potential offered by a region that does not only consist of the agglomeration (Figure 4). Of the remaining third, which favoured a delimitation that was restricted to the agglomeration, 52% saw a conflict between the basic concept of metropolitan regions and the inclusion of rural areas, while 58% cited the advantages of clearer communication and cooperation structures in a smaller region.⁴¹ It is surprising that a correlation analysis showed no significant differences between the statements of municipalities within the agglomeration and its fringes.

³⁶ "If there should be subsidy opportunities, regional delimitation will lead to unfairness" (Birkenfeld). "Allocation should be flexible in fringe zones. Circumstances might also change over the years" (Bitz).

³⁷ "Otherwise one day the entire country will be a metropolitan region". (Assamstadt); "If the metropolitan region reaches as far as Creglingen, then it will adjoin the metropolitan region of Nürnberg, which includes the neighbouring district of Ansbach. Under such conditions there will be no more rural areas at all. This is absurd, as the concept of metropolitan regions only makes sense when there are other spaces from which it can be delimited" (Creglingen).

³⁸ "Everyone who feels a sense of belonging is welcome. Anyone who can contribute something should be able to do so, if necessary all the way to Lake Constance" (Neuhausen auf den Fildern).

³⁹ "Politically speaking, the community forms part of the Enz district and thus also of the Karlsruhe district. If these rigid spatial planning allocations can be dispensed with, I would answer the question with a "yes" (Mönsheim).


⁴⁰ "The core (Stuttgart agglomeration) is, according to the state development plan, clearly delimited. In the fringe zones, the transitions are intentionally fluid. The link to the metropolitan region may be stronger or weaker, depending on the field of activity. Thus it is guaranteed that adjoining areas that can make significant contributions can be integrated" (Heilbronn).

⁴¹ "According to the stipulations of the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning, the MR consists of the agglomeration and its fringes – this is the legal definition. Rural areas do not necessarily form part of this" (Nagold).

meration area and those of rural municipalities. Rural regions that favour limiting the metropolitan region to the agglomeration argued that their municipalities are hardly affected or stated that they feared the financial consequences of inclusion.⁴² Smaller municipalities were far more open to large-scale delimitation than larger municipalities. Even just belonging to the various regional associations played a role in this regard. While 45 % of the VRS municipalities advocated limiting the metropolitan region to the agglomeration area, this figure varied between a maximum⁴³ of 32 % (Heilbronn/Franken) and a minimum of 16 % (Neckar/Alb) in the adjoining regional associations. As expected, more municipalities which, according to the 2002 State Development Plan, are located outside the EMRS region, favour large-scale delimitation, while more municipalities that are located within the EMRS would prefer a restriction to the agglomeration area.

A transformation of the Stuttgart regional association, i. e. an adaptation of the current regional delimitation both with regard to concrete tasks and with regard to levy-based financing, etc. was mentioned quite often⁴⁴. "Territorial consolidation" is also regarded as "desirable" by the VRS, although it is also seen as being unlikely at present (Ludwig 2006). A certain tendency in this direction may be derived from the layout-form given the metropolitan region in the 2002 State Development Plan, which allocates regional centres of the adjoining regions to the EMRS. This would, however, result in a reassessment of the central places (Ludwig 2006).

Figure 4: Sense of belonging and preferred delimitation (author's diagram)



The regional assembly of the VRS prefers a large-scale delimitation and just under half the votes are in favour of the expanded metropolitan region that includes the adjoining regional associations. Surprisingly though, the lord mayor of the state capital Stuttgart described the agglomeration and its fringe zones according to the 2002 State Development Plan as a suitable region, contrary to his statements at the steering committee meeting. A clarification of financial roles is for the regional assembly, like the municipalities, an essential factor for both the clear delimitation option and for potential network cooperation.

⁴² If it is intended to include some rural areas into a larger spatial region, this will – in my opinion – be done for financial reasons in an attempt to lighten the financial burden for the city of Stuttgart" (Trochtelfingen).

⁴³ Mathematically speaking, this would result in 33 % in East Württemberg. However, the response rate is too low to allow conclusions to be drawn.

⁴⁴ "So not constantly inventing pretentious names with excessive bureaucracy, but checking existing structures and efficiently adapting them to new requirements" (Magstadt).

The draft for the regional development concept for the extended region (VRS 2006: 2) makes provision for raising the municipalities' awareness of their affiliation to the EMRS. This was only partially successful in 2006/2007. Thus the survey showed that half the municipalities that were outside the EMRS according to the original delimitation in the state development plan did not (yet) feel a sense of belonging (Figure 4)⁴⁵. Smaller municipalities and those in rural areas tended more often to view themselves as not belonging.⁴⁶ Some municipalities in the Northern Black Forest regional association are more strongly orientated towards Karlsruhe.⁴⁷ Surprisingly though, a total of eight municipalities within the core region of the EMRS declared that they did not belong. These statements are surely closely linked to the lack of knowledge sometimes found among the municipalities with regard to the metropolitan region (Figure 9). Corresponding doubts were expressed several times by municipalities in the fringes of the VRS.⁴⁸ In some cases, municipalities also differentiated between official, political or administrative affiliation and their perception of a reality of non-affiliation (e.g. Niederstotzingen), the minimal effects that they expected (Öhringen), or the wish not to be part of it (Owen). Bad Urach, on the other hand, stated that although the town was not officially included in the metropolitan region, it felt itself to be part of it due to its "perceived proximity" and close interconnections and links. The fact that according to the 2002 State Development Plan Bad Urach really does belong was not known in the settlement itself (Ewald 2007).

6.4.3 Flexible geometries and network structures

These days the economic activities and interconnections of metropolitan regions increasingly extend beyond the traditional administrative borders of urban regions (Krätke 2007: 143). The Stuttgart Region Economic Development Corporation therefore regards the delimitation discussion as being of secondary importance. Profiling of the EMRS should be based on themes and innovations not spatiality. One possibility would be the flexible and non-discriminative model of "development at two speeds". An extension of the metropolitan region could also be based on themes, for example incorporating medical technology in Tuttlingen (Rogg 2007). Within the Working Committee on Business and Innovation (Arbeitskreises Wirtschaft und Innovation 2005: 1) headed by Rogg and the director of the VRS, there was consensus that "the European metropolitan region should be functionally and not strictly spatially defined". No specific spatial delimitation is required, even for subsidy programmes. In any case, so far, infrastructure (e.g. trans-European networks), cooperation and interconnections have been the target of subsidies rather than the metropolitan region itself. Thus, as with attempts to bring about a paradigm shift in cohesion policy via the METREX network, the regional delimitation of the metropolitan region is here irrelevant (Steinacher 2008).⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Thus, for example, the municipality of Assamstadt in the Heilbronn/Franken region commented that "Stuttgart is too far away".

⁴⁶ "On the one hand it would be desirable to be within the metropolitan region in order to participate in its development. On the other hand there is no sense in designating a metropolitan region which then includes thinly populated parts of the Swabian Alb" (Bitz).

⁴⁷ "As a Baden community, we are strongly orientated towards Karlsruhe and the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart hardly affects us." (Eisingen); "According to the state development plan of Baden-Württemberg, we are allocated to Karlsruhe; nevertheless we are striving for project-related cooperation" (Pforzheim).

⁴⁸ Due to its position far from Stuttgart, Großerlach does not really regard itself as part of this region; the concept is intransparent, as "so-called affluent suburbs" have been hardly involved in the process or informed ... they are actually only welcome to foot the bill" (Großerlach).

⁴⁹ METREX demands a LEADER programme for metropolises (Metro-LEADER).

The lord mayor of Stuttgart regards an open network of equal partners as a good alternative to a clear delimitation.⁵⁰ Depending on the tasks at hand, this may result in varying spatial borders (Schuster 2006: 109 f.). Some Neckar/Alb representatives are sceptical about this. The mayor of Münsing, for example, regards any equality of positioning with Stuttgart as basically unrealistic (Kreibich 2006: 23). Nevertheless the Neckar/Alb Regional Development Concept 2005 (REKNA) also demands that networks of cooperation should form according to the competences available and not as hierarchies or power structures. The European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart is to be "promoted by the concerted action of many equal partners" (Merkel 2006a: 1).

Among the municipalities, 61% could imagine such a network structure, largely because functionally orientated cooperation is regarded as easier, and decisions to participate in certain projects would be possible on a case-by-case basis. 32% rejected a network structure, because they, variously, regarded the organisational costs as being too high, wanted clear regulations,⁵¹ did not regard it as practicable due to existing "jealousies" (Remseck), or did not regard the implementation of a goal-orientated policy as possible (Sersheim). The remaining municipalities either gave no response or could imagine both variants. Network structures received most support for specific fields such as tourism, where the municipalities saw a great deal of networking potential with surrounding areas. A correlation with geographical position shows (Figure 3) that the VRS municipalities are least in favour of a network structure, while municipalities that according to 2002 State Development Plan do not fall into the EMRS are very open to the concept of a network structure. Here, too, there are relatively clear differences between the core and peripheral areas of the EMRS.

At the regional assembly of the VRS, 72% were able to imagine project-related network cooperation, e.g. in the aerospace industry or the logistics sector. What is important in this regard is that financial participation and the role of the VRS should be clarified along with the delimitation question.

The statement of the director of the Heilbronn/Franken regional association (Hein 2007) may be regarded as quintessential: although he regards a clear delimitation as factually and scientifically impossible, he regards clear borders as essential for planning. Districts therefore have to be fully integrated, so as to create a "stable entity". Factually, each specific function has its own functional area, as may be seen from the catchment area of the Stuttgart opera house. According to Maull's boundary girdle method, border regions are always critical. An actor-related delimitation thus remains the only option, as while making a cut may be sensible, it is not politically possible (Russ-Scherer 2006).

6.5 Planning culture and metropolitan governance

Unlike the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, the responsibility for the management and implementation of the EMRS was also subject to an intensive discussion process.⁵² The problem was that the responsibilities and jurisdictions of the various actors were and are unregulated. While the state development plan relatively vaguely refers to a basis of decentralised organisational structures, the Ministry of Economic Affairs re-

⁵⁰ "The only strategy for the development of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart that promises success" (Schuster 2008).

⁵¹ "I regard it as very important for the identifying characteristics of a metropolitan region that an outsider should know where the metropolitan region begins and where it ends" (Aidlingen).

⁵² "The goal appears to be clear, while the route and the roles of the actors have obviously yet to be defined." (Münsingen) "The structural debate constitutes an obstacle, but appears to be unavoidable" (Bosch lord mayor of Reutlingen 23/04/2007).

gards this as the task of the regional associations, while the Governor allocates a decisive role to the VRS (Ludwig 2006). As Hartmann (regional assembly of the VRS) points out, clarification of where responsibilities might fall away is necessary in order to avoid double structures.

Since its designation in the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities the management of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and its external representation and international positioning has been handled by the VRS. The directly elected regional assembly of the VRS presents with its portfolio of legally assigned tasks and the network of structures and projects a "model for cooperation within a specified metropolitan region that has received much attention in Germany and Europe" (VRS 2006a: 1). The "leading role" of the VRS within the metropolitan region has been both certified by the Ministry for Economic Affairs (Bullinger 2005: 2) and categorised as a compulsory task by the regional assembly (VRS 2006a: 10).

With relation to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, the VRS has been active on national and international committees from the very beginning. The director of the VRS, Dr Bernd Steinacher, is currently the chairman of the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany and METREX. For some years now, the VRS has had an office at the European Union in Brussels, enabling it to lobby for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. This corresponds to one of the approaches in Guiding Principle 1, which calls for the metropolitan regions to show a stronger presence on the European and international stage (MKRO 2006: 712). The VRS (2006a: 3) believes the implementation of the metropolitan region concept by the Stuttgart region to have been very positive thus far: "Overall, the Stuttgart region is nationally and internationally regarded as a centre of competence for regional networking, strategy formation and project implementation, as well as the embodiment of the European metropolitan region approach."

One problem is, however, constituted by the spatial restriction imposed on the VRS sphere of tasks, which the founding law for the VRS (Section 2) precisely defines as encompassing the administrative area of the Stuttgart region, i.e. the core city and the adjoining districts of Ludwigsburg, Böblingen, Esslingen, Göppingen and Rems-Murr. This also applies to the finances (including levy-based financing) as well as to the region's European Union office in Brussels, for example. In the absence of legislation realigning the jurisdictions and the representation, the VRS would therefore be unable to make its resources available to a new metropolitan committee with differing delimitation (Steinacher 23/04/2007). An imaginable option would be to use the VRS activities to serve an extended area (Reutlingen, Tübingen, Heilbronn) to prevent parallel development. This requires however clarification of the external representation rights⁵³ (Bopp 23/04/07). In this regard, the VRS submitted a proposal to the steering committee suggesting the establishment of a coordination committee for the European metropolitan region at the VRS main office. This would allow the VRS to serve as a platform for all participants in the EMRS (VRS 2007a: 2).

Another possibility could be the expansion of the spatial area covered by the VRS, so that it matches the metropolitan region as delimited in the state development plan, or alternatively the establishment of a regional district within the Stuttgart region. Both

⁵³ "My observation is that things are diverging. There may be conflicts if there is no clarification, for example when there are two representatives for the Stuttgart EMR in Europe. In the worst case this results in a split" (Bopp 23/04/07).

reform recommendations are expected to encounter a certain amount of "bitter resistance" (DIFU 2004: 46).

6.5.1 Expansion of the spectrum of actors

Although the "Stuttgart model" is frequently viewed very positively from the outside (e.g. by Kamal-Chaoui and Prieb 2005), the growing discussion about the delimitation of the metropolitan region (Chapter 6.4) was accompanied by debates about implementation strategies, forms of governance and responsibilities. On the one hand these discussions were initiated by neighbouring regional associations that felt unrepresented by the VRS and pushed ever more strongly for a say in the processes of implementation and metropolitan governance. There were, for instance, fears in the Neckar/Alb region that the Stuttgart region regards itself as "the sole representative of the EMRS at national and international level" (Stöhr 2006: 3). The Ministry of Economic Affairs supported this approach with the statement that "the implementation of the development goal of the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart ... is also the responsibility of the regional associations affected". "Without intensive cooperation" between many regional actors in various institutions and at various levels, the "long-term 'metropolitan region' project cannot be successfully managed and promoted" (Bullinger 2005: 2).

At the same time, the core city of Stuttgart also complained about a lack of integration. The lord mayor of Stuttgart therefore organized a joint strategy discussion in September 2005. To implement the regional development tasks allocated to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart in the state development plan, a "network of equal partners" was established. This network relies on mayors, district councillors, the chairmen of the regional associations and representatives of universities, chambers of commerce and regional organisations. Using the motto "governance without government" this open voluntary association is to ensure the best possible consensus with regard to tasks and projects, but without creating new bureaucracies and administrative levels. In order to clarify the remit a steering committee was established and four working groups were initiated: Science and Education; Business and Innovation; Tourism and Marketing; Neckar and Transport Infrastructure. The integration of the regional centres outside the Stuttgart core region was increased by appointing the lord mayors of these cities to lead the working groups. Concrete projects are to be used to "achieve a win/win situation for the various network partners and the following goals" (Schuster 2006: 110):

- Strengthening regional cooperation
- Joint lobbying work in favour of regionally significant infrastructure
- The development of joint marketing to promote the region as an excellent business location with outstanding tourist opportunities.
- Promotion of the development potential of the Stuttgart EMR by means of joint regional planning goals

The top priority is to "develop the "brand" of the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart into a guarantee of quality and excellence, thus positioning it as the *engine of Germany*"⁵⁴ (Schuster 2006a: 4).

Problematic in the medium term was that personal invitations were sent out by Lord Mayor Schuster to the regional centres outside the VRS (Reutlingen, Tübingen, Heil-

⁵⁴ Boldface and underlining in the original text.

bronn), but not to the large district towns within the VRS (Esslingen, Ludwigsburg, etc.), which thus did not feel that the motto "everyone can participate" applied to them (Gust 2007).

In subsequent months the activities of the VRS, the capital city of Stuttgart and the adjoining regional associations tended to be uncoordinated. The steering committee initiated by Mayor Schuster encountered an increasing level of resistance from the major district cities in the Stuttgart region. The members of the steering committee weren't accepted as representatives of the EMRS by the above-mentioned cities. And the non-integration of the VRS met with disapproval.⁵⁵ In case of failure of an equal-numbered and jointly organised steering committee, the proposed alternative was a joint solution involving the large district cities and the VRS, but possibly excluding the state capital of Stuttgart (Zieger et al 2007).

The development of this competitive situation between the VRS and the steering committee headed by Lord Mayor Schuster was due to the fears of the adjoining regions that the VRS aimed to implement the metropolitan region as its own project (Gust 2006). By contrast, the VRS regarded the efforts of the other regional associations as "freeloading", i.e. profiting from the benefits of the metropolitan region, but not wishing to participate in financing (Fritz 2008) (Chapter 6.7). Blatter (2008: 33) assumed that the actions of the lord mayor of Stuttgart aimed at weakening the VRS, the institutional strength of which is regarded as a threat to the institutional autonomy of other actors.

Cooperation continues to be difficult today. The many fears about the loss of competences and responsibilities and the possibility of being left behind by continuing developments are exacerbated by animosity between key actors,⁵⁶ attempts at personal profiling by individual actors, mutual accusations⁵⁷ etc. In addition, there are fears about political-administrative spheres of responsibility and about finances. For instance, fears were expressed that EU funding "should not only go to the Stuttgart region" (Stöhr 2006: 3). On the other hand, representatives of the VRS found that statements made by the other actors had been followed by little concrete action and that the response to offers of cooperation was reserved (Steinacher 2008). The regional assembly of the VRS regarded cooperation with the neighbouring regional associations as important, but most comments also indicated the need for improvement.

Overall, the "dispute about responsibilities, representation tasks", etc. is seen as having hindered improved positioning, as "competing major regions" have used the time to clarify the form and content of their metropolitan regions (Stuttgart regional forum 2007: 4). Ewald (2007) even demands that the process be restarted with the aid of professional consultants, because he sees the subject of metropolitan regions as having been unjustifiably relegated to the position of a sub-theme.

⁵⁵ "It is not acceptable to us that the decision about topics, content and focal points is being made by a steering committee that has been more or less randomly organised and in which a number of members have no adequate mandate for such decisions. Unlike you, we are also not of the opinion that the metropolitan region should be organised without the VRS" (Letter from the lord mayor of Esslingen, Mr Zieger, to Lord Mayor Schuster, dated 19.04.07).

⁵⁶ In addition to several corresponding verbal statements, which cannot be quoted here, Durchdenwald wrote in the *Stuttgarter Zeitung* (p. 22) on 24/04/2007: "It was probably the new lord mayor of Tübingen, Boris Palmer, and Bopp who managed to counteract the strategy of failure followed by Schuster and Steinacher (who were united in mutual loathing) and who set the course for a long overdue compromise" as well as "This quarrel placed an additional burden on the already tense relationship between Schuster on the one hand and the lord mayors and politicians of the region on the other hand".

⁵⁷ Some of these statements were very emotional and their truthfulness is difficult to judge for an outsider. This subject will therefore not be discussed in more detail at this point.

6.5.2 The creation of new structures

The basis for management and planning implementation of the metropolitan region concept could theoretically lie in the creation of a new administrative level. At the moment, however, this is desirable neither from a political nor from a planning point of view⁵⁸ and would be extremely difficult to implement. In the same way, plans to dissolve administrative levels such as regional councils and districts and to reorganise the allocation of responsibilities (Gust 2007) appear scarcely realistic. The option of forming a company, favoured by Russ-Scherer (2006), has also not been pursued.

All the actors involved agreed that the establishment of an umbrella organisation or superordinated external representation structures for the expanded region is neither desirable nor at present realistic (Stöhr 2006: 3); that a reduction of the European metropolitan region concept to "advertising is neither useful nor necessary" (VRS 2006a: 4); and that the administrative limitations imposed on the spheres of responsibility of the actors cause problems. Intensive discussions were therefore held in an attempt to find a solution.

The municipalities within the Stuttgart region and the adjoining regional associations have, together with the city of Stuttgart and the VRS, attempted to establish "the successful model of network- and project-related cooperation also in the area of the metropolitan region." (BMVBS, BBR 2007: 45). On 23 April 2007 a coordination committee was formed in which the regional and municipal actors of the metropolitan region were to "meet on equal footing" to exchange information, coordinate and create joint projects.

After lengthy discussions about the number of members⁵⁹ and their origins, the committee was formed as follows, reflecting the dominance of the core region:

12 members of the VRS

12 municipal representatives of the Stuttgart region

12 municipal or regional representatives from outside the Stuttgart region

The lord mayor of the city of Stuttgart chairs the meetings, while his first deputy is the chairman of the VRS. Both are also members of the council, together with the regional director of the VRS and a representative of the municipalities or regions outside the Stuttgart region. The concrete implementation of the recommendations of the committee, which cannot take any binding decisions, is handled by working groups, which include representatives from industry, research and public institutions. Administration is to be handled by the office of the VRS, where the European metropolitan region will also have its headquarters. As no new institution was created, responsibility for external representation is decided on a case-by-case basis; otherwise each corporate body continues to speak for itself (Stabsabteilung Kommunikation 2007). As could be expected, the members of the VRS favoured the VRS as representative for the metropolitan region. On numerous occasions the possibility of appointing a metropolitan region chairman or creating a similar position was suggested. Schuster regards this as requiring clarification within the coordination committee. This most critical point is still unsettled.

⁵⁸ "We do not want any new administrative and organisational structures. Cooperation should concentrate on projects resulting from mutual resources" (Merkel 2006a: 1).

⁵⁹ The Neckar/Alb regional association recommended a 20:20:20 ratio, which would be close to an associative form and thus represent a metropolitan region forum (Gust 2007). Six weeks after the establishment of the coordination committee, the lord mayor of Stuttgart again questioned the distribution of seats, as he regarded the state capital as being inadequately represented. (Letter from Lord Mayor Schuster to the VRS chairman Bopp dated 8 June 2007).

The current coordination process between the various actors is regarded as "difficult" (see Vallée 2007; Steinacher 2008; Schlossnikel 2006 and 2008), especially when critical points have to be discussed.⁶⁰ Thus far the coordination committee has only met once, thus its effectiveness is regarded as rather low, both by the VRS and by the city of Stuttgart (Steinacher 2008; Schlossnikel 2008). The size of the committee is also seen as problematic: if deputies attend then 50–60 people are involved (Schlossnikel 2008). The assessment of the coordination committee by the regional assembly of the VRS has been mostly negative. Only two positive assessments were received, while a further four people did not want to give their opinions at this point. The remaining assessments ranged from "harmless" to "limited possibilities" and "less effective", all the way to scathing judgements such as "unworkable" or "all talk and no action". Ewald (2007) therefore suggests the formation of a strategy committee that would be independent of direct political influences and would be responsible for compiling a list of criteria. Once the preliminary work has been done, a separate organisational structure with the relevant authority could be established. The East Württemberg regional association, on the other hand, regards the current structure very positively, as it allows for participation in decision-making on projects and themes, and also promises increased support and an improved awareness of the region by the state government (Eble 2008).

The long-term management options for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart are still seen in a number of different way.⁶¹ While the lord mayor of the city of Stuttgart favours voluntary network partnerships, as these are not associated with "a bureaucratic superstructure" (Schuster 2006: 110), as well as "loose cooperation" (Schuster 23.04.07), the director of the VRS regards it as necessary in the long term to create a structure with independent authority "that as well as being adequately equipped will have the necessary jurisdictions" (Steinacher 2002: 377). Following the example of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, the director of the Heilbronn/Franken regional association can imagine political representation in combination with business representatives (Hein 2007). Both are supported by numerous representatives of various organisations that consider it impossible to carry through concrete decision-making within the loose framework of cooperation (including Bopp 23.04.07) and that see as indispensable a democratically legitimised institution (a limited liability company, association, special-purpose organisation or public agreement) (e.g. Gust 2007; Rogg 2007) or a shared business principle for the community of responsibility (Vallée 2007), or indeed even a legal basis (Schmiedel RV VRS). Another recurring topic were the actual administrative structures, especially the regional associations, which are unable to meet current challenges and the spatial form of which does not correspond to the reference frameworks of the population. A short-term change of these administrative structures is, however, regarded as improbable (Vallée 2007).

In 2008, the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning approved a Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning (MORO) which was to deal with aspects of interregional partnership. The basis of the project is the compilation of a regional development concept, within the framework of which agreements about the form of future spatial development can be made between the sub-regions (BBR 2008).

⁶⁰ Thus the lord mayor of Tübingen, Boris Palmer, announced an end to cooperation if the VRS should continue to insist on Tübingen contributing towards the new exhibition grounds (cited in the Reutlinger Generalanzeiger, 23/11/2007: 5).

⁶¹ "I do not see any dynamics in this process, except that the Stuttgart regional association and the city of Stuttgart regularly, and to great public effect, fight about leadership roles" (Lenningen).

6.5.3 Assessment of management options by the municipalities

The municipalities surveyed diverged a great deal in their opinions about suitable institutions for the management of the metropolitan region. No mentioned committee obtained a clear majority. The VRS received 35 %, however if the values for the two so far non-existent categories "institution at state level" and "new, autonomous committee" are combined, the result is a total of 38 %. Both the Stuttgart regional forum⁶² and the lord mayor of the core city lagged far behind. It is interesting to note that the VRS is a controversial management option even in its own region. Almost half the VRS municipalities could not imagine the VRS as the institution responsible for the implementation and management of the metropolitan region, although 16 municipalities outside the VRS area considered this to be a good solution. A total of 23 % of the municipalities surveyed requested a new committee. Irrespective of the institution preferred, clear structures and spheres of responsibility were seen as an essential precondition.⁶³

Despite the very positive assessment of the "Stuttgart model" (Chapter 6.2), the VRS is regarded very critically by some of the municipalities.⁶⁴ Thus several municipalities suggested dissolving an existing planning level. Among others, the Stuttgart regional association was mentioned.⁶⁵ The municipalities particularly criticised levy-based financing for the VRS and the utilisation of funds (especially for the new state exhibition), as well as what the municipalities perceive as being the limiting of their planning authority by regional planning specifications about independent development. The structure of the VRS, with the decoupling of responsibilities for finance and activities, is regarded as "not necessarily suitable for meeting the challenges of the present and the future" (Schuler 2006).

As expected, the regional assembly favours the VRS as the management institution. However, 38 % can either also imagine other options or are undecided. In most cases, a concrete institution is seen as important. Despite the generally positive assessment of network structures (Figure 3), only 17 % regard project-related partnerships as an appropriate means of implementing the metropolitan regional concept. The involvement of additional actors is favoured by 68 %, with business and research being mentioned by most respondents.


⁶² The Stuttgart regional forum was established in 1995 and is a social initiative, the main purpose of which is to create regional awareness of the area covered by the VRS.

⁶³ "National/international recognition as a metropolitan region will mainly depend on the existence of a real administrative structure with real responsibilities" (Neidlingen).

⁶⁴ "The Stuttgart region is a good example of how not to do things. It has expensive rail traffic, centralism, high costs, little democracy and an additional administrative level" (Höfen/Enz).

⁶⁵ "The dissolution of the Stuttgart region would be a welcome move. It contributes nothing to the rural fringes" (Erkenbrechtsweiler).

Figure 5: Possible restriction of municipal planning authority and preferred strategies of implementation (author's diagram)



Some 38% of the municipalities surveyed would like to involve further actors in the implementation of the metropolitan region concept. Particularly mentioned were the regional associations adjoining the Stuttgart region, the state government as well as the rest of the state political body, and the state capital of Stuttgart; in addition, economic and tourism associations as well as non-governmental organisations were mentioned. Some 52% found the current spectrum of actors to be adequate and feared rather that the effort needed for cooperation could become too great. In general the constitutionally anchored municipal planning jurisdictions represent a rather critical point for regional governance. Three quarters of the municipalities regard a limitation of their planning authority to be out of the question (Figure 5),⁶⁶ while most of the few municipalities that felt otherwise could imagine giving up sub-areas such as superordinated spheres, e.g. transport/infrastructure or saw the necessity of inter-municipal planning within agglomerations.

6.6 Implementation strategies: lighthouse projects and guiding principles

The VRS has spent the last ten years using a multiple-track approach to implement the metropolitan region concept into planning practice. Lobbying was undertaken (for example, via the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany, METREX and the European Union office in Brussels) to increase the visibility of the region and external integration. In parallel with this, concrete measures and projects were designed and implemented in the region (Table 5). This approach to the development of the EMRS is to continue, whereby the VRS sees concrete measures and projects as the way to optimise the region's competitiveness: the main task ahead. This is to involve "where useful and possible cooperation with partners ... from the adjoining sub-regions" (VRS 2006a: 10). Important elements are key projects and the compilation of guiding principles and development concepts in order to determine profiles and focal points (Ludwig 2006).


In addition to the strategies of the VRS, there is currently work being undertaken in parallel, as both the steering committee and the Stuttgart Regional Forum (2007: 29 f.) initiated working groups dealing with similar subjects. The reference area of the

⁶⁶ "The municipalities are the most important planning level. We have had bad experiences with the VRS, because even at this level planning authority is not respected. A metropolitan region raises fears of an even greater distancing from everyday practice" (Bönnigheim). "Together with the districts and the regional associations, the municipalities are the most important political-administrative level in the metropolitan region. The municipalities "support" the metropolitan region "from below" (Heilbronn).

steering committee focuses on the larger region, that of the Forum on only the VRS region. There is at present no coordination, although overlaps became clear during the closing symposium of the Stuttgart Regional Forum (Forum Region Stuttgart 2008).

Both exemplary lighthouse projects and the development of all-encompassing guiding principles, as well as a combination of the two approaches, have been discussed as implementation strategies for the metropolitan region concept. The EMRS municipalities favoured the compilation of an all-encompassing guiding principle/concept, which received 69 mentions. Lighthouse projects were mentioned 56 times, often in the hope that they might compensate for the apparent lack of activities and successes.⁶⁷ 22% of the municipalities would like to combine both approaches, while 27% only wanted lighthouse projects and 38% only the development of guiding principles. Ten municipalities had no decided opinion in this regard and failed to answer the question. Ewald (2007) proposed a combination of guiding principles, lighthouse projects and publicity work, as public acceptance of the metropolitan region depends on its rapid success. The regional assembly clearly favours lighthouse projects. Only 13% regarded the compilation of guiding principles as the best implementation strategy.

Figure 6: Assessment of previous spatial planning concepts, and assessment of the need for action by the regional assembly (author's diagram)



The municipalities were also asked whether the goals linked to the formation of the European metropolitan regions could not have been achieved using previous spatial planning concepts. As shown in Figure 6, more than half (52%) of the municipalities were of the opinion that new concepts were unnecessary, 32% did not share this opinion⁶⁸ and a total of 14% did not respond to the question, showing that there is a great deal of uncertainty. This is also reflected in the reasons given. Thus, for example, the previous concepts were regarded as being "on too small a scale" or as being limited to planning rights. The lack of an all-encompassing concept, including the "European view of things", the lack of a municipal voice and the time delay in the implementation of concrete plans were also criticised. The counter-argument was that the state development plans and the regional plans are suitable planning instruments. These would need to be adapted to the new goals, however. In some cases the possible influence of spatial planning was also criticised.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ "Implementation is difficult". "Thus far there has been no perceptible result for Herrenberg" (Herrenberg).

⁶⁸ "A planning and activity level comparable with that of the metropolitan regions did not form part of previous spatial planning concepts." (Heilbronn) The concepts were "too disjointed from an administrative, regional and task point of view and not flexible enough" (Nagold).

⁶⁹ "The influence of spatial planning is clearly being overestimated. The real situation may be described as the "normative force of facts" (Haiterbach).

6.6.1 Regional development concept including the development of guiding principles

In 2003 the VRS and the adjoining regional associations of Neckar/Alb and Heilbronn/Franken used the "Strategy paper for further development of cooperation within the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart" to develop three main recommendations for action: the establishment of formal and informal cooperation, joint external representation, and financing and burden sharing (VRS 2007: 9). A regional development concept for the extended EMR Stuttgart is currently being developed and is being promoted as a Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning (MORO). All five regional associations are involved in this (VRS 2006: 3). Although regional development concepts as informal instruments are not legally binding, they are supposed to encourage the commitment of the actors involved and thus to develop further potential and contribute towards the implementation of formal planning (Ludwig 2004: 44).

Thus far, a catalogue of goals has been compiled for the fields of settlement development, gateway and transport infrastructure, and the improvement of the structure of open space. The analysis section, which is regarded as being a mere addition by Hein (2007), is now almost complete. All five regional associations are involved in the MORO project, developing requirements for action and the approaches to be used (Hein 2008).

Figure 6 shows how the regional assembly of the VRS judges the concrete need for action. An increase in international visibility, improved internal networking, and improved regional identity are regarded as priorities. Networking outside the Stuttgart region is seen as being of least significance. The Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany sees a need for the state government to "promote business-related technology" and to orientate further education towards the growing demand for highly qualified graduates (Baumann 2006: 6).

6.6.2 Lighthouse projects within the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

Lighthouse projects mainly focus on weaknesses that hamper the current development of the metropolitan region, but also on areas that could further strengthen metropolitan functions. In addition, concrete projects – unlike guiding principles – provide the opportunity to generate "perceptible added value", which is why cooperation in the field of business and innovation is to be based on individually defined projects (Arbeitskreis Wirtschaft und Innovation 2006: 1). The working group "Research and Education" is in favour of the development of concrete and practical project ideas that will help raise the profile of the region. This includes a research portal, a "day of knowledge" to be attended by the media, as well as a special educational exhibition (Arbeitskreis Wissenschaft und Bildung 2006).

Currently in discussion as possible lighthouse projects are the project and cluster initiatives for the aerospace industry, regional transport management and the Fuel Cell User Alliance (VRS 2006a: 5), as well as the Neckar landscape park that aims to improve the attractiveness of this area.

Some successful examples for project-orientated cooperation between a variety of actors within the European metropolitan region are the Mobilist Project, with a consortium of 35 partners, the establishment of 13 regional skills centres, and the BioRegio STERN network. The latter initiative in the field of regeneration biology won first prize at the Bioprofile Competition run by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, which was linked to EUR 18 million in subsidies and the founding of

numerous companies. The Stuttgart region was twice running awarded the "Award of Excellence for Innovative Regions", the prize given by the EU Commission to the most innovative region in Europe.⁷⁰

6.7 Financing problems experienced by the Metropolitan Region

Direct subsidies for metropolitan regions are currently not planned, not even in the EU subsidy guidelines for the 2007–2013 period. On the basis of the existing subsidy guidelines, the only region that can be subsidised from the European fund for regional development is the state of Baden-Württemberg (Stabsstelle des Oberbürgermeisters 2006: 2). In contrast to France (Chapter 4.3), it is not planned that the metropolitan regions should be supported by either the federal government or the states. Subsidies are, however, available from the European Union for individual projects, of which twenty are currently being carried out in the EMRS (Rogg 2007), and for trans-European networks,⁷¹ cooperation and interconnections.

The field of financing and compensation is regarded by the VRS (2007: 10) as particularly significant concerning the "distribution of costs and benefits in the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart". The VRS (2006a: 10) therefore regards "financing based on solidarity" as a precondition for cooperation with partners from the adjoining sub-regions.⁷² The same applies for the network initiated by Lord Mayor Schuster (Schlossnikel 2006). At the meeting of the steering committee held on 23 April 2007, it was agreed that the financing of joint projects should take place "in accordance with the benefits the project in hand would bring for the interested parties". For the VRS municipalities the regional costs are already covered by the regional levy (Stabsabteilung Kommunikation 2007). Thus for the first time the financing of the metropolitan region, one of the most controversial points in the ongoing discussion about implementation, has been fixed in writing in planning practice. Because of its special position, the VRS financially participates in large-scale projects in the region, e.g. Stuttgart 21 (EUR 50 million) or the new state exhibition (EUR 65 million) (Steinacher 2001: 74), in contrast to the adjoining regional associations. The Neckar/Alb regional association and its municipalities thus made no financial contribution towards the new state exhibition, despite their geographical proximity.⁷³ This discrepancy has resulted in intensive discussions and has played a decisive role in debates about regional delimitation and governance structures (Chapter 6.4 and Chapter 6.5).

Financing the metropolitan region is also an important issue for the municipalities,⁷⁴ although they do not regard themselves as being obliged to make any significant financial contribution,⁷⁵ but rather tend to concentrate on the subsidy programmes of various institutions. In particular, municipalities within the VRS fear that further

⁷⁰ <http://www.bioregio-stern.de/node/2> (Retrieved on: 27/06/2006).

⁷¹ The major Stuttgart 21 project must be seen within this context.

⁷² Any participation in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart by the other regional associations must involve a fair division of costs (Steinacher 2006: 2).


⁷³ "The cost allocation for individual projects and measures must necessarily centre round the question of who obtains clear benefits and to what extent. It can and may not be that the rural area at the eastern border of the region and at a distance of about 100 km with no rail connection helps, e.g., to finance the new exhibition grounds, while immediately adjoining cities and districts make no contribution, only because they "happen" not to be members of the VRS" (Großerlach).

⁷⁴ "It is not necessary to limit municipal planning authority. It is far more important to impose binding financial regulations" (Heilbronn).

⁷⁵ "Additional expenditure on the part of the municipalities should definitely be avoided" (Mundelsheim).

financial burdens could be added to the regional levy-based financing.⁷⁶ The assessments of the regional assembly of the VRS are more or less the same as those of the municipalities. The only difference is that expectations of the federal government are higher. One cannot, however, assume that the weighing up of the costs and benefits by the respondents is in this case correct.

Figure 7: Possible reduction in subsidies outside the metropolitan regions and financing models (author's diagram)



Close links exist between the type of financing and the delimitation of the metropolitan region. If finance is to be (partially) drawn from the municipalities, then clear regional delimitation is seen as necessary; if financing is to be provided by other sponsors (e. g. the state) then a clear delimitation is no longer seen as necessary.

Some 58% of the municipalities thought that general support for the growth engines was justified, with support not only referring to finance,⁷⁷ only one third rejected this. The reason given most often for this rejection was existing (financial) strength⁷⁸ and the disadvantages that such support might have for other areas. Endorsement was motivated by citing the expected spill-over effects, also on an international scale.⁷⁹ The regional assembly of the VRS was over 90% in favour of supporting the growth engines. More than 80% had no fears that this could lead to a decrease in financial means in other places. The reasons given for this view were, on the one hand, the efficiency of using funding for growth engines, and, on the other hand, the existing support given to rural areas by the state, the federal government and the European Union.

A correlation between those in favour of supporting growth engines, with the number of residents and the geographical position of the municipality showed that particularly municipalities within the VRS and the agglomeration area are in favour of such support, as are municipalities within the original EMRS region. Rural municipalities tended to be sceptical.⁸⁰ Nonetheless, a total of 72% of the municipalities feared that support for the metropolitan regions would lead to a scarcity of resources at other points, including

⁷⁶ "The small municipality of Aichelberg fears that the creation of a Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart will cause it to be further burdened by costs that are impossible to meet. There are no benefits for us as a municipality in the fringes. This is why we completely reject this project" (Aichelberg).

⁷⁷ "This is less a financial issue, as it often only leads to entrainment effects. The acceleration of decision-making and approval processes appears to be more important to me." (Bitz); "Demographic development will in any case lead to migration away from the rural areas" (Remseck).


⁷⁸ "Stuttgart is the richest metropolis in Germany" (Höfen/Enz).

⁷⁹ "We will ... in any event lose out badly to the new growth regions in Asia" (Rudersberg).

⁸⁰ "The agglomerations and especially the state capital already have much higher subsidy rates than the rest of the state (Assamstadt).

within their own municipality,⁸¹ as well as generally within the rural areas. Only 17% were unable to share these fears⁸² or saw a change in the framework conditions.⁸³ The other municipalities did not comment on this question.

Figure 8: General support of the growth engines and assessment of the spill-over effects (author's diagram)



6.8 Internal and external integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

In addition to the important aspects of economic development and a good competitive position on the international market, the current challenges facing the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart appear to involve an improvement of its external and internal image.

6.8.1 External integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

According to Steinacher (2006: 4), "external integration" involves the incorporation of the region into a European and international context. Among other things, Steinacher (2003: 3) complains that notwithstanding its actual achievements the international visibility of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart is relatively low. This is linked to the fact that despite the economic success of the "Stuttgart model" the image of the metropolitan region has not decisively changed on an international scale (Wolfram 2004: 79). However, the image of the Stuttgart region as a high-tech region is being put in the "heads of decision-makers in politics and business" and on the "European map" (Vallée 2003: 13) through the involvement of the region and the activities of the regional director as chairman of METREX, as well as of the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany, indeed the VRS acts more or less as a branch of the latter organisation. This appears to be increasingly successful. Hager (2007) described the VRS as the perfect example of marketing. Kujath and von Schlippenbach (2002: 30) regard the Stuttgart region as one of the few that has created an "externally viable actor" via the VRS, i.e. the internal organisation. Relevant here are the European office in Brussels and the representation of the joint interests of European metropolitan regions (METREX). In this regard, the association acts relatively independently of the political level of the state government, even though the state of Baden-Württemberg is itself trying to achieve a good international competitive position by portraying itself as an economic region with a

⁸¹ "E.g. the Stuttgart exhibition is drawing financial and economic resources out of the municipality of Deckenpfronn" (Deckenpfronn).

⁸² "We have no objections, due to the generous sponsorship of the EU" (Grosselfingen). "Only if there are still very strong, good regions, will the weaker regions also do well, enabling them to obtain subsidies" (Neckar/Tenzlingen).

⁸³ "Changes in the purpose of subsidies and the reallocation of funds are though an everyday political issue when the relationship between cause and effect changes for a subsidy policy. Such a change has taken place as a result of global competition between economically strong centres" (Heilbronn).

unique profile. This has led to attempts to interlink the various actors more closely under a single umbrella (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2006: 36).

Table 5: Strategies of the VRS for the external integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (compiled according to VRS 2006a: 2 f., Vallée 2003: 15 f. and Steinacher 2001: 75)

| Major themes | Strategic approaches | Involvement of the VRS and effects |
|---|---|--|
| All-encompassing strategies | Increased visibility | Intensive regional locational marketing with a newly developed business communication system and an image campaign Presentation events with project presentations, e. g. in Brussels Internet presence and multi-lingual advertising documentation Application to host the Olympic Games Involvement in large-scale projects such as Stuttgart 21 and the new state exhibition |
| Gateway infrastructure | New exhibition | Choice of location based on regional planning + joint financing |
| | Stuttgart airport | Safeguarding of expansion areas, improvement of the urban rail connections |
| | Stuttgart 21 and TEN-axis | Task managers for regional planning and the urban railway system |
| | Urban railway system | Links to gateway infrastructures and state exhibitions |
| | Logistics and freight traffic | Establishment of a freight traffic and logistics centre |
| Incorporation into German networks | Membership of the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany; the VRS director is chairman | Active influence on spatial development policy; organisation of congresses; briefing and lobbying about the metropolitan region approach. |
| Integration into European networks and projects | European office of the VRS in Brussels | Direct contacts and influence in Brussels; locational marketing; monitoring of subsidy programmes, observation of legislation process |
| | Active membership of European Networks | Access to a large range of cooperation partners, knowledge and opportunities METREX – a network of European metropolitan regions POLIS – transport management EMTA – European short distance public transport task managers EURADA – economic development agencies Lisbon regions – dynamic metropolitan regions with their own offices in Brussels |
| | EU projects carried out jointly with a European partner | 2006 participation in 20 EU projects with an EU subsidy volume of € 9 million. Indirect effect: increasing the visibility of the metropolitan region |
| | Lobbying work in Brussels | Includes the organisation of congresses; background discussions; cooperation on compiling working papers, etc. |
| | European skills atlas | A list of all relevant Europe-related activities and actors of the Stuttgart metropolitan region. |

To date, the activities presented in Table 5 focus on the area covered by the VRS. This is due to territorially fixed responsibilities (Chapter 6.4) and to current governance problems (Chapter 6.5). The VRS (2007: 10), however, thinks that its intensive lobbying work for metropolitan regions at national and international level will also have spill-over effects for those parts of the EMR that lie outside the Stuttgart region.

6.8.2 Internal integration of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

The VRS aim to achieve internal integration by "bundling the strengths of the region and, through partnerships, also those of adjoining regions." Their strategies include "real networking" through establishment and extension of short distance public transport and "virtual networking" through forming a regional 'unity of ideas and projects'" (Ludwig, Steinacher 2008: 171 f.). The directly elected regional assembly of the VRS is regarded as being of major importance for internal integration (VRS 2006a: 1), as is the link between the EMRS and successful projects that can bring about a positive change in public image (Rogg 2007). The main factors for internal integration mentioned only refer to the VRS region. A joint regional development concept is being worked out jointly with the adjoining regional associations (BMVBS 2007a: 45). A metropolitan ticket for short distance public transport is planned, but there are still implementation problems due to the mixed-source financing required (Steinacher 2008).

A current inventory (VRS 2007: 9 f.) shows intensive cooperation within the greater region. This includes cooperative projects such as BioRegioStern, the concept for the Neckar landscape park, and municipalities from the Neckar/Alb and Northern Black Forest regional associations joining the Stuttgart Region Marketing and Tourism Organisation. The Stuttgart Region Economic Development Association (WRS) also cooperates on projects with institutions outside the region, e.g. involvement in exhibitions. Within the framework of the current Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning, network and cluster initiatives associated with economic, locational and innovation subsidies are to be better publicised and linked (BBR 2008).


Current obstacles to internal integration within the VRS come from the marginalisation fears of the municipalities in the fringe regions that at times see themselves and their needs as being neglected by the metropolitan core. These fears are exacerbated by differences in the strictness with which planning specifications are applied in the adjoining regional associations, which leads to fears that both population and business may move away. The frequently cited question of differences in financial participation, which is particularly resented in the fringe areas of the VRS, also continues to cause problems. Explicit mention was made of the large advertising poster for the Neckar/Alb region, "The future begins here", which stands on the B 27 at the border between the Neckar/Alb and Stuttgart regions and which has not been taken down, despite the frequent demands made by the VRS (Steinacher 2008; Edelmann 2006) (see cover picture). On the other hand, problematic is the fact the political-administrative borders of the VRS area represent an abstract unit, which the German Institute of Urban Affairs (DIFU 2004: 146) believes to be incomprehensible to residents. Not only does this preclude any feeling of identification with the region, but it also prevents residents from being aware of the services being rendered by the VRS. The results of the surveys also made this very clear.

An essential aspect of internal integration is comprehensibility and transparency, as well as the degree of information about the metropolitan regional concept. The majority of regional assembly members of the VRS felt that they had been adequately informed about the concept of metropolitan regions. Those who did not, explained this by citing

non-participation in committees such as the coordination committee or argued that there was (at yet) no metropolitan region concept. Nevertheless it is surprising to note that one fifth of the members of one of the main committees of the metropolitan region felt uninformed.

More than half of the municipalities surveyed found the concept of metropolitan regions to be obscure and incomprehensible.⁸⁴ Confusion is also created by the term "European metropolitan region", as the concept at times gave the impression of being an EU instrument,⁸⁵ surprisingly enough also among representatives of the regional assembly of the VRS.

Figure 9: Comprehensibility and transparency of the metropolitan region concept and level of information (author's diagram)



If the responses of the municipalities are correlated with their geographical position, the spatial category and the size of the municipality, it emerges that the concept is less comprehensible to small municipalities and to those in rural areas than to those that are larger or more centrally situated. Nonetheless, several larger municipalities within the core region of the EMRS also criticised the fact that there is currently "no transparent concept for an EMR of Stuttgart" (Ditzingen) and that "intentions are not being openly communicated" (Ludwigsburg). There were significant differences in the level of knowledge between mayors who were members of the regional assembly or comparable institutions and who were very well informed, and mayors who did not sit on any such committees.⁸⁶

The relatively small proportion of municipalities who found the concept of metropolitan regions to be transparent and comprehensible has much to do with the apparently insufficient level of information. As shown in Figure 9, only 16% felt sufficiently informed, while 72% felt that they had not been informed at all or had received too little information. In addition, another 14 municipalities did not complete the questionnaire sent to them, but replied by email that this was because they felt too ill-informed about the metropolitan region concept. Up to January 2007 the only information that the mayors had received was a brief explanation at the county council.

⁸⁴ "Everyone is talking about it, but no-one can clearly define" (Assamstadt). "It is too theoretical and the targets are not clearly defined" (Birkenfeld). "Everything I have been able to gather from the press was so confusing that my interest was absolutely not aroused" (Magstadt). "Unbalanced, too imprecise – if it were not a political programme, the term 'dishonest' would be appropriate" (Niederstotzingen).


⁸⁵ "It would be important for all parties involved to find out which concrete goals are being pursued by the EU with the metropolitan regions" (Hardthausen).

⁸⁶ "If I were not a regional councillor, I would have practically no information (except perhaps a superficial press report)" (Neuweiler).

There had been no attempt to involve the mayors through the municipal council, through any central event or even through the use of postal information.⁸⁷ Ewald (2007) complained about this deficit and directly related it to the lack of transparency of conceptual goals. On the other hand, neither the VRS (Steinacher 2008) nor the East Württemberg regional association (Eble 2008) saw any urgent necessity to involve all mayors via targeted information events.

Differences in the publicity work carried out by the regional associations at this point were relatively clear. Although the VRS was engaged in very active external marketing (Chapter 6.8.1), some of the municipalities within the region had received no information at all.⁸⁸ The same complaint was recorded for the regional associations of Heilbronn/Franken and the Northern Black Forest. The East Württemberg regional association intentionally did not undertake any publicity work, as it was felt that internal discussions over formalities should not be made public (Eble 2008). The best informed municipalities were those of the Neckar/Alb regional association; it seems likely that this was related to the intensive affiliation discussions held at the time (Chapter 6.4). The poor information flow was criticised throughout.⁸⁹ On the other hand, the director of the Stuttgart region economic development corporation (Rogg 2007) stated that the subject of metropolitan regions actually played no role in public discussion and community politics. This becomes comprehensible when viewed against the background of media reporting almost exclusively on problems of the implementation process.

Figure 10: Desire for increased integration in the implementation process and questioning of the equality postulate by the metropolitan regional concept (author's diagram)



Half of the municipalities (51 %) expressed a wish for increased integration into the implementation process. This was partially related to the financing problem, i.e. they wished to influence decisions that they would later have to help finance. The wish for

⁸⁷ One mayor within the VRS (Schlaitdorf) heard the term "metropolitan region" for the first time through my questionnaire in 2006 and had printed out information pages from Wikipedia in preparation for a personal interview. According to his statements, he had not previously received any information on the subject and, he said, he was not the only one in this position. One mayor from the Northern Black Forest regional association (Enzklösterle) did not complete the questionnaire, but sent me a series of questions with a request for information.

⁸⁸ "There was no clear, unequivocal information base, neither at meetings at district level nor anywhere else" (Neckartenzlingen). "Hardly any such information appeared at the municipal council. No information was received from the VRS, or at least not by the smaller municipalities. There is in any case a general impression that only the larger municipalities count" (Kammerlander 2006).

⁸⁹ "It will be interesting to see whether the 'endangered' municipalities are to be informed or involved to the extent that they can deal with the subject in any meaningful way" (Municipality 2, which prefers to remain anonymous).

increased integration was expressed particularly often by municipalities that belonged to the Neckar/Alb regional association (66 %).

Smaller municipalities could imagine integration via other institutions such as the municipal council.

Another decisive factor for the successful implementation of the metropolitan region is the involvement of the population as well as the municipalities.⁹⁰ Thus far, the metropolitan region concept is, however, viewed as being too detached from reality and as having no practical relevance (Riethe 2008).

6.9 Cooperation or competition between the EMRS and other regions

The VRS has sought cooperation with other metropolitan regions via the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany and METREX (Bullinger 2005: 2). Cooperation can result in multiple win/win situations, e. g. in the case of transnational EU tenders. The initiative "Four Motors for Europe" (Chapter 4.1) is to be seen in this context and involves long-term cooperation with Lyon in the field of biotechnology, with Turin in the field of mobility and with Stockholm in the field of media (Vallée 2003: 15). At the same time there is competition from Lyon and Turin, not only with regard to attracting companies and highly qualified staff, etc., but also with regard to large-scale infrastructural projects. Thus Lyon and Turin fought for the trans-European network's southern route to Budapest, in direct competition with Stuttgart (Steinacher 2004).

The question of cooperation or competition also arises with regard to the extended surroundings. Decisive aspects here are potential spill-over effects and fears regarding the marginalisation of peripheral areas. As shown in Figure 10, the majority of municipalities within the EMRS fear that the concept of metropolitan regions will question the axiom of equal living conditions,⁹¹ although views as to whether effects on areas outside the metropolitan region are positive or negative are more or less balanced. 48 % of the regional assembly of the VRS also regard the effects as positive, while only 12 % see them as negative.

By stimulating overall economic growth, positive spill-over effects are created that also benefit the non-incorporated areas.⁹² With reference to negative effects, the municipalities frequently mentioned fears of increasing spatial disparities. The possible spill-over effects of the metropolitan region are regarded considerably more negatively by smaller municipalities and those in rural areas than by those located within the agglomeration area. Municipalities that would have been located outside the EMRS according to the state development plan also see the spill-over effects more negatively. Indeed, the intensive discussions about official membership of the EMRS (Chapter 6.4) become more comprehensible when set against the background of fears that spill-over effects are likely to have a negative impact.

⁹⁰ "The initial success will depend on the extent to which all the politically and economically responsible parties are involved, even down to the smallest municipality in the metropolitan region, so that by including the population multiplying factors can produce a metropolitan region on a European scale" (Münsingen).

⁹¹ "The metropolitan region harbours the risk of further centralisation, leading to an abandonment of the goal of creating equal living conditions in Baden-Württemberg" (Hirrlingen).

⁹² "Some of the spill-over effects will be so strong that from a macro-economic point of view an improvement will result, which would not have been achievable in the previous form. The metropolitan region provides an even market and the various regions develop their specific potential "in accordance with the market", so that they can well supplement each other" (Neckartenzlingen).

Within the EMRS it is mainly the rural municipalities that feel disadvantaged by developments. The situation has turned out to be particularly precarious for municipalities within the VRS that must participate in levy-based financing, that see the metropolitan region as bringing few or no benefits, and that – due to their location – are unable to benefit from specific subsidy programmes for rural areas.⁹³

It is interesting to note that the adjoining state of Bavaria is pursuing a strategy of developing the areas between the metropolitan regions, with the aim that, for instance, the Bavaria/Swabia region should profit from Munich and Stuttgart (Jarothé 2001: 38). This would apply to both the areas in East Württemberg that form part of the EMRS and the regiopolises around Ulm and Neu-Ulm (Chapter 8.4.2). It is surprising to note that this approach was completely unknown to the representatives of the East Württemberg regional association (Eble, Riethe 2008).

6.10 Summary and prognosis

The long-term international commitment and lobbying of the VRS (e.g. the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany, METREX) has not only contributed significantly towards increasing the international visibility of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, but has also generally raised awareness of the significance of the German metropolitan regions and their expectations of metropolis-orientated policies. However, within the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart some of the basic dilemmas between theoretical and practical planning are relatively plain to see. These arise mainly out of overlaps between various regions, spheres of responsibility and actors' interests, as well from the many vague organisational arrangements that cause problems when it comes to concrete implementation.

The delimitation of the metropolitan region continue to be subject to discussion. The envisaged network cooperation of a metropolitan core with a large-scale community of responsibility collides with the fixed territories of many actors, the lack of clarity as to the financing base, the fears of the "fringe areas" of being left behind by current developments, and deeply rooted experience that shows that belonging to certain regions or institutions is decisive for obtaining subsidies. The territorial limitation of all current planning levels leads to parochial thinking and makes it difficult to even imagine dividing planning regions and accepting that sub-regions might then belong to a metropolitan region. Although networking cooperation is positively regarded in principle, many planning practitioners regard it as unsuitable for day-to-day use. This mainly concerns the financing question, which continues to constitute a significant obstacle and causes implementations in planning practice to fail.

Territorial fixation also renders the establishment of governance structures that do not cover the same territories difficult. In this regard, too, there were considerable fears that if other actors were permitted to represent the region, some sub-regions might be overlooked or, even, that "freeloaders" might use resources. Blatter (2008: 33) even goes as far as to state a destabilisation of the "very successful regional governance landscape" of the Stuttgart region through forced networking and joint profiling with "completely different neighbouring regions". The coordination committee that after much discussion was established as a compromise has not so far lived up to expectations. This is made clear by the fact that the external representatives of the metro-

⁹³ "In the past the X-region was regarded as part of the Stuttgart region (corresponds to the metropolitan region), but was seen merely as a leisure resource without any special development potential, and yet did not have the subsidy resources of a rural region" (Municipality 1, which preferred to remain anonymous).

politan region are to be chosen on a case-by-case basis. As in practice this cannot always occur quickly enough, there is the risk of parallel appearances by different actors and different parts of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart at the same event.

One solution that has been suggested several times could be to create a spatial/functional congruence between the metropolitan region and the Verband Region Stuttgart, in a similar way to the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region. This would involve a change in the region covered by the association, with the integration of the adjoining agglomerations around the regional centres of Tübingen, Reutlingen and Heilbronn, and the ceding of the rural regions in the east to the adjoining regional associations. This would create a metropolitan level with clear borders and clear responsibilities. However, such territorial consolidation would probably meet with such vehement resistance that current implementation seems impossible.

One possible solution is thus to use the opportunities which the special position of the VRS as a politically and democratically legitimised institution of the metropolitan core offers, in combination with the establishment of functioning and accepted governance structures for constructive cooperation within the framework of a large-scale community of responsibility. One condition of this would be the withdrawal of individual, political and regional interests, which currently have a strong influence on the discussion. Further, it would be necessary to have consensus about priority tasks, including the required financial arrangements. Compulsory regulations could bring progress to the long-winded discussions about the "right" regional layout and the "optimal representatives", etc. and allow constructive implementation.

There are two other points of decisive significance. There must be more internal publicity work, as many fears may be traced back to a lack of information. This will not only strengthen awareness of the region, which is currently at a low level, but also awareness of the real challenges. This is less a matter of regional integration or responsibilities than the need for cooperation in the compilation of strategies for coping with climate and demographic change, maintaining an attractive work and living environment and surviving in the face of the competition, which is increasingly to be found in Asia (Steinacher 2008).

Also of importance is that, above and beyond the state development plan, the state government should produce strategies for all regions, thus reducing the marginalisation fears of rural areas (Chapter III).

7 The Rhine/Neckar European Metropolitan Region

In 2005, the Rhine/Neckar region became the latest addition to what are now eleven German metropolitan regions. Unlike the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region is not only located in Baden-Württemberg, but also includes areas in Rhineland-Palatine and Hesse (Map 1 and Map 4).

Map 4: The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region



7.1 Current situation in the urban agglomeration

The urban agglomeration at the confluence of the Rhine and the Neckar is one of the economically strongest regions in the Federal Republic of Germany. This region is one of the three leading life sciences locations in Germany (the others are in Munich and Berlin) and houses the largest chemical industry cluster in Europe (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006). Decision-making and control functions are mainly determined by the fact that large international companies such as BASF and SAP have their head offices here. These two companies alone have a market capitalisation of about 32 billion Euros, i.e. some 13 % of the total DAX market capital (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006). Other significant corporate headquarters in this region are those of Heidelberger Druckmaschinen (a market leader in the printing industry), as well as Rudolf Wild

GmbH (food additives). Ten of the hundred largest companies in Germany have their head offices in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 7).

The Rhine/Neckar region is one of the European leaders with regard to the relative concentration of research-intensive high-technology industries and medium/high-technology industries. It is also one of the few European metropolitan regions that has an over-proportional share of knowledge-intensive, market-related business services. Krätke (2007: 29) identifies only ten metropolitan regions in the European Union that have a location quotient of more than 1 in all three of the above-mentioned sub-sectors.⁹⁴ Mannheim⁹⁵ is also in the first rank with regard to the combined number of employees in high- and medium/high-technology industries as well as high-technology services (Krätke 2007: 67). With 49.2% of all employees working in knowledge-intensive fields, the Mannheim metropolitan region is one of the leaders in the European Union. Of the 57 agglomeration areas included by Krätke (2007) in his empirical analyses, only seven have a value higher than that of the Rhine/Neckar region (Krätke 2007: 40 f.).

One special feature of this metropolitan region is its political-administrative structure, resulting from the integration of sub-regions from the three states of Baden-Württemberg, Rhineland-Palatine and Hesse. This cooperation has an official history dating back more than 50 years. A municipal Rhine/Neckar working group was created in 1951 and as early as 1969 the Rhine/Neckar triangle produced a state contract to regulate cross-border cooperation with regard to spatial and state planning, including regional planning (Spannowsky 2004: 4). In 1998 the range of tasks was extended by adding several aspects such as joint economic development and integrated transport planning (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 1). This form of cross-border cooperation was unique in Germany at this time (König, W. 2007: 65), but it was essential, as every "corner" of the "triangle of federal states" had on its own "structural data that were only slightly above average" (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005: 2). The metropolitan region is not perceived as an independent region at national or international level, due to its position at the intersection of three German states. External visibility is thus clearly out of step with the potential of the region (Voscherau 2005: 11).

Due to structural problems, the core city of Mannheim has received funds from the Target 2 Subsidy Programme of the European Union. The founding and relocation of companies from growth sectors is to accelerate a change in the economic structure of the city. In 2006 2.6 million Euros of subsidies were made available by the state of Baden-Württemberg and 6.3 million Euros by the EU for this purpose (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2006: 37 f.). Mannheim accordingly achieved the lowest metropolitan function index of all the official metropolitan regions (Einig et al 2006: 626). Other categorisations may be taken from Table 2.

7.2 The Rhine/Neckar European Metropolitan Region

The path towards recognition as a metropolitan region was an innovation in the history of metropolitan regions, as it was mainly based on pressure exerted by companies, especially BASF, which was then followed by political efforts (König, W. 2007: 6).

⁹⁴ Krätke (2007: 28) defines a location quotient > 1 as meaning that the proportion of employees in the relevant sub-sector within the urban regions considered should exceed the proportion of total employees in the 25 EU countries represented by this sub-sector.

⁹⁵ Although Krätke refers to the metropolitan region as Mannheim, this being the city with the largest number of residents, the region is explicitly regarded as a polycentric metropolitan region (Krätke 2007: 18 f.).

7.2.1 Stages in the process of recognition as a European Metropolitan Region

In the state development plan of Baden-Württemberg (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002), the region is not mentioned as a metropolitan region, unlike the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and the potential metropolitan region of Upper Rhine (Chapter 8.1). In fact, the Rhine/Neckar region is deemed to form part of the Upper Rhine European catchment area, which according to Paragraph 6.2.3, is to be regarded as a European metropolitan region. It was years later and after regional initiatives undertaken by the Rhine/Neckar triangle itself that the ambitions of the urban agglomeration area to be recognised as a European metropolitan region were first supported by the Ministry for Economic Affairs in Stuttgart, and the issue raised at the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005: 5). According to Schulze (2006), the Ministry for Economic Affairs was surprised and irritated, as this leap forwards by the Rhine/Neckar region was not in accordance with the state development plan.

The initiative to apply for metropolitan region status was spearheaded by the deputy chair of BASF, Eggert Voscherau,⁹⁶ who established the "Future of the Rhine/Neckar Triangle" initiative (ZRND) with the aim of developing the region into one of the "most attractive and competitive regions in Europe" by 2015 (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005: 3), and by so doing of course to strengthen the location of BASF (König, W. 2007: 73). Another factor at this time was the extension of the EU towards the east, which caused local actors to fear a shift in EU subsidies to the new members of the EU. The ZRND involved the key players in the region and developed what was in Germany a "unique regional private-public-partnership" as well as exceptional regional dynamism (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 22 f.). The procedure followed by the ZRND was, however, regarded as problematic by various groups of actors, as on the one hand the contexts of political and social decision-making varied, while on the other hand the ZRND was sometimes regarded as a "purely economic event" (König, W. 2007: 74).

Regional conferences have been repeatedly held since 2000 in order to bring together representatives of politics, business, research and administration and thus to promote the development of the region. They resulted in the formulation of "Vision 2015" and a related strategy and structure report (Spannowsky 2004), which are to provide concrete recommendations for action (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 20 f.).

At the "Regions on the Move" event held in July 2004, the so-called "Ludwigshafen Declaration" was signed by the three governors in question. This gave rise to changes in the existing contract between the three states, so as to develop the "cooperative structures for single-level regional planning and efficient regional management" (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005: 3). In addition, it demonstrated the "clear support" of all three state governments for the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, thus emphasising the "major significance" of the region for the various states (Specht 2005: 16).

On 19 November 2004 a meeting of the Rhine/Neckar Spatial Planning Association, which was responsible for coordinating the application process, took a resolution to apply to the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning for recognition as a metropolitan region. This decision was emphatically supported by the steering committee of the ZRND on 2 December 2004. On 22 February 2005, a statement supporting the metropolitan region was signed by more than 50 mayors and district councillors at the symposi-

⁹⁶ The key actor Voscherau played such an important role in the process of gaining recognition as a metropolitan region that W. König (2007: 91) refers to a "learning system with a Voscherau factor".

um on "The Rhine/Neckar triangle en route to a European metropolitan region" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005a: 1). After the symposium, the press commented on the "rare unanimity that crosses all political borders and even three state boundaries",⁹⁷ along with the "high level of acceptance"⁹⁸ of the Future of the Rhine/Neckar Triangle initiative and the statement made by German Chancellor of the time, Gerhard Schröder, "That's just fine, Mr Voscherau, we have got the message".⁹⁹

The reason for the intensive efforts made from within the region was, on the one hand, the knowledge that the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning was shortly to decide which of the further candidates for metropolitan region status were to be accepted, and, on the other hand, the belief that "special subsidy programmes may be expected over the next few years". The opportunities linked to recognition as a metropolitan region were therefore evaluated as very positive by the region (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 1). Improved external visibility for the region was seen as being particularly important, placing the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region "on the map" (Franz 2005: 11) would provide the basis for the locational decisions of business and the "formal, commensurate significance" for the economic area (Voscherau 2005: 11).

7.2.2 Metropolitan functions and political will

As shown in Chapter 7.1 the indicators of metropolitan functions developed by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005) are convincingly fulfilled by the Rhine/Neckar agglomeration area as far as the decision-making and control function is concerned. In addition, the international aspect of economic activities is amply documented by the export rate of over 50 % (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006).

This applies equally to the innovative and competitive functions. In this regard, mention must be made of the oldest university in Germany, the internationally famous University of Heidelberg, which is a world leader in the field of medical research. Among European leaders is the faculty of economics at Mannheim. The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region classifies itself as a "leading innovation think tank" due to the quality of its 22 universities which attract about 81.000 students, supplemented by numerous non-university based research institutions (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006). Two percent of the region's employees work in research, twice the national average. The Rosengarten Congress Centre was awarded eighth place in an international assessment, first place nationally. Indeed, by completing the SAP arena with capacities of up to 15.000 and through networking with the three exhibition centres the region has managed to win in the cultural sector a place in the "Champions League" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 14).

The gateway functions are particularly well fulfilled with regard to regional and transregional road connections. The region is one of the "foremost turnstiles in European passenger and goods transport" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 1). Within the metropolitan region are the A 5 and A 6 motorways, which link the region to the metropolitan regions of Stuttgart, Rhine/Main and Northern Switzerland (Basel and Zurich). The Mannheim/Ludwigshafen harbour with its inter-modal connections is Europe's second largest (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 9). Although the

⁹⁷ Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung dated 15.03.2005.

⁹⁸ Mannheimer Morgen dated 23.02.2005.

⁹⁹ König, M. 2007: 92.

metropolitan region does not have its own international airport, its proximity to Frankfurt airport (30 minutes by car) – the largest airport on the European continent with the most intercontinental connections worldwide – provides it with an excellent national and international network (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 9). The connection of the region to the high-speed rail network is currently under intensive discussion. Current ICE high speed train connections between Frankfurt and Stuttgart stop at Mannheim. However, the high-speed rail network is currently being extended in a project seen as being of "highest European importance". As part of this project the German Railway plans a direct non-stopping link between Frankfurt and Stuttgart, with a "connecting branch" to the Mannheim main station (Deutsche Bahn 2007). This is regarded as "decoupling" and "excluding the region from international connections". The executive director of the Rhein/Neckar Metropolitan Region Company (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar GmbH: MRN) thus sees the rapid extension of Mannheim main station and the full connection of the region to the ICE high-speed train network as "urgently required and non-negotiable" (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006a: 2).

In addition to fulfilling the metropolitan region criteria, the Rhine/Neckar Triangle suggested that the "best preconditions" for successful implementation of the concept were given through the region's "political creative will" and "cooperation and organisational structures like nowhere else in Germany" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 1). In the opinion of Seimetz¹⁰⁰ (2006), these cooperative structures were a "decisive point" for the inclusion of the agglomeration area in the group of metropolitan regions.

Unlike the other three newly recognised metropolitan regions, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region was not named after a dominant city but has a geographical description. The name Rhine/Neckar has a long historical tradition and enables actors from all three states to identify with the metropolitan region. The polycentric region also has no clearly dominant core city. The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (2005: 185) and Krätke (2007) both use the name of the city with most residents (Mannheim: 308.000 residents) to represent the agglomeration area. The next in rank are Ludwigshafen (163.000 residents) and Heidelberg (143.000 residents). Smaller centres such as Worms, Speyer or Landau are regarded as "crystallisation points for their respective sub-regions" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 3).

7.2.3 Expectations for the Metropolitan Region

The expectations for the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region are generally very high. Overall, positive economic development as well as better international positioning and visibility are expected, as is improved cooperation within the region and a restriction in the powers of other planning levels and authorities. Image and regional identity are also of relatively high significance. The Neckar/Odenwald district classified internal development as being of equal importance to external effects. Internal development is based on using endogenous potential and promoting regional identity (Landratsamt Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis 2006: 7).

¹⁰⁰ Dr. Hans-Jürgen Seimetz, Director of the Rhine/Neckar Association; quoted in König, M. (2007: 70).

Two thirds of the municipalities within the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region regard the concept of metropolitan regions as being largely positive for them (Figure 11), as opposed to just under 24%, who regard it as bringing no advantages. The sceptical municipalities are mostly in the rural regions and in Rhineland-Palatine.

Figure 11: General expectations of the municipalities and assessment of various aspects of the metropolitan regional concept (author's diagram)





Figure 12: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept (author's diagram) and organigram of the metropolitan region (Metropolregion)



Another significant factor is that none of the municipalities understood the question as referring to negative aspects and there was only one case with no expectations. Thus the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region stands in clear contrast to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (Chapter 6.3). The majority of municipalities questioned believed the metropolitan region concept to be well suited for stimulating economic growth, dealing with the effects of globalisation, and accelerating European integration (Figure 12).

7.2.4 Organisational structure and spectrum of actors

As far as the form of the organisation and the spatial delimitation is concerned, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region clearly differs from the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. Some of the main reasons for this lie in the different histories of the two regions. While in Stuttgart the establishment of a suitable organisational structure and the discussion about spatial delimitation took place after the metropolitan region designation, these questions were pre-empted in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region by dealing with them as part of the application procedure for official designation. The

organisational structure (Figure 12) was therefore clear from the very beginning. A decisive factor was that it was seen as essential that the Rhine/Neckar area be regarded as a "united economic area", thus necessitating "coordinated, joint promotion by the three state governments affected" (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005: 2). More than five decades of inter-state cooperation meant that, to a certain extent, it was possible to use tried and tested structures.

On 1 January 2006, at almost the same time as the region's designation as a European metropolitan region, the Rhine/Neckar regional association (Verband Region Rhein-Neckar: VRRN) was established. This association is a public body, based on the state contract between the three states of Baden-Württemberg, Rhineland-Palatine and Hesse dated 26 July 2005. This inter-state association is the legal successor to the various separate state institutions, i.e. the Spatial Planning Association Rhein-Neckar, the Rhineland-Palatine Planning Association and the Rhine/Neckar/Odenwald Regional Association. The Rhine/Neckar regional association – like the Stuttgart regional association – has an extended spectrum of tasks and jurisdictions in comparison with "traditional" regional associations. It is not only responsible for spatial planning, cross-border regional planning and regional development but also coordinates: economic development, locational marketing, landscape parks, tourism marketing, leisure facilities, congresses, exhibitions and cultural and sporting events – focusing on their regional significance. In addition, the association has a coordinating function for energy supply, transport planning and transport management (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006).

Unlike the Stuttgart regional association, the Rhine/Neckar association does not have a regional parliament that is directly elected by the population. This is contrary to the original demands by Baden-Württemberg to further develop "the association council into a Rhine/Neckar regional parliament" and so to strengthen the legitimization of the metropolitan region and the sense of identity that residents have with it (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005a: 2). All lord mayors of municipalities with more than 25.000 residents are members of the association council. The lord mayors are intensively involved in the implementation process: the lord mayor of Ludwigshafen is the chairman of the association (Dallinger 2006). In total, the association has 96 office-bearers, of which 46 come from Baden-Württemberg, 39 from Rhineland-Palatine and 11 from Hesse.

The establishment of the interregional Rhine/Neckar association has replaced the very complex regional planning structures that previously existed in this area: the ineffective and inefficient two-step planning process has given way to new planning instruments. The old, "ponderous mesh" of regional planning was able neither to provide the coordination necessary for the entire area nor to forge a regional identity. At the regional level a certain amount of planning was undertaken in parallel, resulting in a mutual weakening of the effects. In addition this multi-level planning system involved additional, unnecessary costs and had complex organisational structures that made it difficult to understand for the local population (Spannowsky 2004). Spannowsky thus recommended a clear division between strategy and operations as early as 2004. The restructuring of the spatial planning association into a Rhine/Neckar regional association was to cover the strategic side, while the establishment of the Rhine/Neckar Management Company (Rhein-Neckar-Management Gesellschaft mbH) would deal with the operational side. The state contract dated July 2005 followed these recommendations and created the required preconditions for more efficient and leaner planning and activity structures, including a significant reduction in bureaucracy at public institu-

tional level. The association now cooperates closely with the Society for the Future of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region and the Chambers of Trade and Industry.

The Society for the Future of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Zukunft Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar e. V.: ZMRN) was formed with the purpose of sponsoring the metropolitan region. This is mainly achieved by means of focused projects in the fields of science and research, education, health, arts and culture, sports, and regional studies and regional identity. In addition, networking within the region is being sponsored so as to promote lighthouse projects and to achieve multiplier effects. A high-quality executive committee and board of trustees support the establishment of the corresponding network. Another decisive contribution is furthering the regional dialogue between politics, business and research (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006). Corresponding lobby work is in progress. Thus the members of the state, federal and European parliaments are invited once a year in order to draw attention to the concerns of the region, in the hope that regional interests will then be supported by appropriate policies (Lowack 2006).¹⁰¹

Most of the larger companies of the region as well as the districts and municipalities are now members of this society (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2008). Subject to the agreement of the executive committee, membership is open to all. In contrast to loose cooperation, bringing the various institutions and actors together within an official society makes cooperation more strongly institutionalised and binding, despite the option of resigning from the society (Seimetz 2006).¹⁰²

The board of the ZMRN has not been democratically legitimised, as its members are not elected by the population of the metropolitan region. In addition, not all potential groups of actors are represented on the executive committee, which W. König (2007: 86 f.) regards as an "institutionalised interface between the leading regional actors". The focus on cooperation between business and politics continues to be reflected in its composition. Although the ZMRN articles of association only make provision for representatives of the political, business and research sectors to serve on the board, an extension is possible in principle (König, W. 2007: 87). This is, however, not being pursued because it is seen as likely to obstruct efficient decision-making (Seimetz).¹⁰³ The VRRN is represented in the ZMRN by the chairman of the association.

Operational business is driven by the Rhein/Neckar Metropolitan Region Company (MRN). This company was established in July 2006 as successor to the Regional Marketing Rhein-Neckar-Triangle. As shown in Figure 12, the VRRN, the ZMRN and the regional Chamber of Trade and Industry are the sponsors of the company, which takes on a "turntable function for joint regional development". It is thus not only responsible for carrying out projects in its own areas of responsibility, but also for publicity work intended to improve visibility of the metropolitan region internationally. In addition, the company acts as the networking centre that supports and coordinates existing networks, and initiates new ones with regional actors and potentials, thus creating synergy effects. In its own opinion (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006: 2), the establishment of MRN has created a "unique PPP model for regional development from

¹⁰¹ "Just to keep in touch, to advertise the region, and to draw attention to what is important to us as a region. Obviously we are striving towards having these points raised by the various parliamentary platforms in our interests" Wolf-Rainer Lowack, executive director of MRN and ZMRN, quoted in König, M. (2007: 92).

¹⁰² Dr. Hans-Jürgen Seimetz, Director of the Rhine/Neckar Association; quoted in König, M. (2007: 74).


¹⁰³ "I would not necessarily regard this as worth striving for ... at some stage I would then have a committee sitting there that can no longer take decisions." Dr. Hans-Jürgen Seimetz, director of the Rhine/Neckar Association; quoted in König, M. 2007: 89).

a single source". With the founding of the MRN the previously complex actor structures were converted into a leaner and more powerful structure, where cooperation between politics, business and research is institutionalised. Success lies in the fact that a region with "splintered administrative jurisdictions" has been brought together and can now speak "with a single voice" to political decision-makers such as the state or federal government and the European Commission (Beyer 2006).¹⁰⁴

The business centre of the MRN now has a team of more than 20 working on implementing the metropolitan region in planning practice. Only very few of them, however, are employed by the company, most are on release from work in industry (Dallinger 2006). The business centre is partially publicly financed¹⁰⁵ and partially financed from business sources. Thus far, however, only BASF has invested funds in MRN that are not tied to specific projects. Other companies have provided project-related financing or have delegated staff for specific tasks (König, M. 2007: 79). Due to the high proportion of financing that comes from private business, there are concerns that economic issues may dominate the agenda causing conflict between specific interests and cross-issue planning (Preising 2008: 36). M. König (2007: 99) describes the metropolitan region as a "representative of state and business interests" on the basis of its close relationship with industry.

The MRN has two directors: one is also the director of the VRRN, while the other is also responsible for the ZMRN (König, M. 2007: 75 f.). This ensures close relationships, guarantees an intensive exchange of information,¹⁰⁶ and provides for a system of cross-checks between the various organs of the metropolitan region. The VRRN is only able to participate in the MRN due to its new legal basis, which has made sponsorship possible (König, W. 2007: 100).

Figure 13: Satisfaction with the chosen organisational structure and desire for the integration of more actors (author's diagram)



Most of the municipalities questioned were also satisfied with the organisational structures chosen (Figure 13). One of the reasons given for this was the many advantages of combining a limited liability company with an association, which makes rapid action possible without having to dispense with the experience offered by the association. Those municipalities that reacted with scepticism complained that even the

¹⁰⁴ Dr. Rüdiger Beyer, executive director of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce Pfalz; quoted in König, M. (2007: 81).

¹⁰⁵ EUR 200,000 from the VRRN as well as EUR 200,000 for specific projects (Dallinger 2006).

¹⁰⁶ The communication divisions of the two business centres coordinate with one another daily (Dallinger 2006).

leaner organisation was confusing or said that it had too many actors.¹⁰⁷ This reflects the division between the strategic and operational levels that may not have been sufficiently explained to external stakeholders. In a few cases, the high level of involvement of businesses, especially BASF, was questioned.¹⁰⁸

Generally, the municipalities surveyed regard the concept of metropolitan regions as suitable for ensuring increased involvement of the population in the planning process and for increasing cooperation between the various planning levels (municipality, region, state) (Figure 12).

Irrespective of this general assessment, one third of the municipalities would like to see additional actors participating in the implementation of the concept. Those mentioned most frequently were the residents of the metropolitan region, followed by actors from research and science as well as from the rural areas. It is surprising to note that despite the high level of participation of industry, industrial companies were frequently mentioned, BASF and Daimler by name. Prominent residents of the region were suggested as "human" carriers of advertising and sympathy, for instance Helmut Kohl and the singer Xavier Naidoo (Rhineland-Palatine). The municipality of Waldbrunn wanted "lobbyists" at the EU in Brussels.

Those who responded "No" to this question felt that all the important groups of actors were already involved. Some raised fears of overloading the committees, thus posing an obstacle to constructive work.

The municipalities themselves would also like to be integrated into the implementation process to a greater degree. The 51 % who advocate this are opposed by 31 % who regard this as less desirable and 7 % who do not regard this as an option at all. It is surprising to note that the majority of the municipalities (57 %) that want to be less integrated in the implementation process are medium-sized settlements with between 10.000 and 49.999 residents. This applies similarly to municipalities in the metropolitan core, where 41 % are not interested in extensive integration, as opposed to 26 % of those in rural areas.

An increased transfer of planning tasks and jurisdictions to regional level could, of course, imply that the municipalities would transfer or delegate their planning authority to this regional level, at least for particular spheres of responsibility. In the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region a surprisingly high number of municipalities (39 %) could imagine this (Figure 16). In the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart the equivalent value is 17 %. Surprisingly the size of the municipality plays no relevant role here, as may be seen from the corresponding correlation analysis. Those municipalities that could imagine having their planning powers restricted mainly support their view through reference to inter-municipal goals,¹⁰⁹ such as an improvement of international positioning that cannot be guaranteed by local "parochial thinking". Some municipalities (e.g. Waldsee and Weinheim) believe that their planning authority should be given up partially when it comes to larger tasks and projects that cross municipal borders. Municipalities that cannot imagine any restriction of their planning powers argue that municipal autonomy guarantees good development and that specific local knowledge is

¹⁰⁷ "In my opinion there should only be one structure. This dual system is too much of a challenge for the residents" (Hemsbach an der Bergstraße).

¹⁰⁸ "I am rather sceptical about this construction. It certainly also owes something to the unusual commitment of Eggert Voscherau and to the considerable financial contributions made by BASF. Time will tell whether this is sustainable" (Buchen).

¹⁰⁹ "Municipality-based parochial thinking must become subordinate to achieving a good position in international comparison" (Sinsheim).

extremely important; they also fear that rural areas may be at a disadvantage compared to urban areas when planning is undertaken at the metropolitan level (the danger of heteronomy). Some municipalities felt that municipal autonomy was already being cut across by higher-ranking institutions and by the inter-state spatial development plan.¹¹⁰

Thus far the chosen cooperative and organisational structure has been seen to be effective and target-orientated. This institutionalised and functioning cooperation could represent "a decisive advantage" for the region in comparison with other metropolitan regions where such a structure does not yet exist (König, M. 2007: 101). External observers also regard the chosen model as "best practice" (Lohse 2006).¹¹¹ In some cases the funding provided by business is criticised, although the actors questioned by W. König (2007: 89) do not assume that this "asymmetry" need result in serious problems in case of differences. The municipality of Dannstadt-Schauernheim fears that the "lived cooperation" will remain lip service and that ultimately it will all end in fighting over subsidies.

Fears that environmental concerns may be neglected have been heard from Friends of the Earth Germany and the Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union. In response, representatives of nature conservation organisations and trade unions were integrated into the planning committee. Soft locational factors such as landscape, nature reserves and geoparks are also regarded as being very important.¹¹² For example, the association supports the visitors' centre of the National Geopark in Eberbach (Odenwald) (Dallinger 2006). Nevertheless, these matters were viewed with a certain amount of scepticism by the municipalities surveyed (Figure 12). While 54% view the metropolitan region concept as suitable for coping with the consequences of demographic change and 63% regard it as appropriate for ensuring sustainable development, nearly half (47%) are of the opinion that this does not apply to the promotion of nature conservation and environmental protection.

7.2.5 Delimitation and regional awareness

Despite the fact that some observers' perceptions suggest the contrary, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region has an "autonomous catchment area" and a "strong core" with the cities of Mannheim, Ludwigshafen and Heidelberg (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 4), and thus the potential to position itself as an independent metropolitan region. This is also confirmed by an investigation conducted by the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 15), although it was the same institution that raised the question of how the Rhine/Neckar region can position itself between Rhine/Main and Stuttgart (BBR 2005: 185). The clear delimitation also dispels fears that without an independent profile the region will become nothing more than an "overlap" between the "large players"¹¹³ and in political terms will thus not be "visible" from Berlin or Brussels (Dallinger, 2006).

The metropolitan region has been consciously confined to the politically delimited area, thus defining an agglomeration of centres that "really demonstrate close and very close interconnections with one other" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 15) (Map 4). This region includes, in Baden-Württemberg, the urban districts of Heidelberg

¹¹⁰ "The joint spatial development plan can in any event lead to a limitation of municipal planning authority" (Landau-Land).

¹¹¹ "We often hear that our model is seen as very positive and that it could well become best practice" (Dr. Eva Lohse, lord mayor of Ludwigshafen; quoted in König, M. (2007: 100).


¹¹² S. Dallinger (2006) described these parks as "valuable assets".

¹¹³ I. e. the Rhine/Main and Stuttgart metropolitan regions.

and Mannheim, the Rhine/Neckar district and the Neckar/Odenwald district; in Rhineland-Palatine, the districts of Bad Dürkheim and Germersheim, the Rhein-Pfalz district and the Southern Wine Route as well as the independent cities of Frankenthal, Landau, Ludwigshafen, Neustadt an der Weinstraße, Speyer and Worms; and the Hessian district of Bergstraße. The core of this region is therefore identical with the historical Kurpfalz, which was split up as part of the Napoleonic administrative reorganisation (Landratsamt Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis 2006: 2). Surprisingly the Rhine/Main Metropolitan Region declares that there is an overlap with the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region in the south, although the reverse is not affirmed (BMVBS 2007a: 35; 41). The overlap is recorded on the map of the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany (Map 1).

The survey of the municipalities showed that the decision to have a clear boundary is also supported by the majority of integrated municipalities.¹¹⁴ Particular mention was made of the precise jurisdictions,¹¹⁵ the concordance between the area covered by the regional association and the metropolitan region, and the lack of "fuzzy" areas at the fringes. In addition, a link to regional awareness and identity was made, because identification seems easier with a clear delimitation. Only 11% objected to the chosen delimitation. Among other things it was mentioned in this context that areas belonging to the old jurisdictions have been integrated into the metropolitan region but are seen as not belonging there,¹¹⁶ while others have been "forgotten" (municipality of Dudenhofen). The municipality of Rheinzabern even talks of the "destruction of existing structures" with regard to the lack of incorporation of the Karlsruhe area.

Figure 14: Endorsement of clear territorial delimitation and evaluation of a possible network structure (author's diagram)



The correlation between the statements about delimitation made by the municipalities, size of municipality and urban or rural location did not produce any significant results. It is interesting to note, on the other hand, that a correlation with state location showed that all the negative opinions originated in Rhineland-Palatine. One of the reasons given was that a strict boundary that excluded municipalities being just outside the region was difficult to justify (Major of Maikammer). No correlation was made with Hesse for any of these questions, as the corresponding response rate was too low.

¹¹⁴ "The metropolitan region idea must first prove itself in a defined region" (Buchen).

¹¹⁵ "It is not possible to work with "soft" borders" (Neckarsteinach).

¹¹⁶ In this case, this refers to the Neckar/Odenwald district.

However, two thirds of the municipalities questioned also found it possible to imagine a governance model in the form of project- and theme-orientated network cooperation without a clear territorial delimitation. The question is formulated in such a way that a certain amount of agreement is to be expected, but it is nevertheless clear that the municipalities are open to other forms of cooperation.¹¹⁷ This could be the basis for forms of cooperation that extend beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan region. Precisely this aspect was often mentioned by the municipalities that agreed with the idea of clear boundaries.¹¹⁸ The UNESCO geopark was one example given, as it crosses the border between the Rhine/Neckar and Rhine/Main metropolitan regions making cooperation between them part of everyday planning practice (municipality of Neckarsteinach). In some cases theme-specific network cooperation was also encouraged, e. g. with regard to joint transport planning. The correlations between those municipalities supporting networks and the size or spatial category of the municipality resulted in no significant findings. Municipalities that declined network cooperation often supported their point of view by citing the associated delimitation problems and the question of jurisdictions, which would be difficult to clarify.

Discussions about flexible geometries and the incorporation or exclusion of certain areas were thus limited. For example, the state parliament of Baden-Württemberg proposed the incorporation of an "openness clause" in the state contract, which would make it possible to "reach agreement about further areas of regional cooperation" (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005a: 2). In addition, a general openness clause for further regional cooperation, e. g. with the technology region of Karlsruhe or the Upper Rhine region, was discussed. Even the Spatial Planning Association of Rhine/Neckar spoke as predecessor of the VRRN of a region with borders "open to new issues, opportunities and partners" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 23). At this time efforts were being made by neighbouring regions to join the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Pföhler 2005: 1), whereas Karlsruhe missed the opportunity to become a part of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Sinz 2007).

At the current time the director of the VRRN regards an extension of the borders or a structure with flexible geometry as being out of the question.¹¹⁹ He favours clear spatial and organisational structures with unambiguous contact persons. He is, however, very much open to intensive, project-related cooperation with neighbouring regions that results in a win/win situation for both sides. Like the municipal actors, he makes particular mention of the area around Karlsruhe (elite university; nanotechnology) as well as of the formation of a knowledge region of Frankfurt/Rhine/Neckar/Karlsruhe (Dallinger 2006). In connection with this knowledge region, joint projects such as a knowledge atlas and a knowledge portal have been agreed (BMVBS 2007a: 23).


One third of the municipalities questioned could envisage an extension of the borders (Figure 15). The majority of them discussed the advantages of integrating the area around Karlsruhe with its excellent university. In addition, the city of Kaiserslautern was mentioned (potential of the university), as were the municipalities in the southern Odenwald district (orientation towards the Neckar region). The majority of the municipalities (67%), however, rejected this, as the delimitation was regarded as being meaningful and the region as being sufficiently large.

¹¹⁷ "Networking efforts could result in successes that would otherwise be hindered by municipal borders" (Edenknoben).

¹¹⁸ "It is precisely in these fringe areas that networks should be able to transcend borders to enable synergies" (Fahrenbach).

¹¹⁹ "I don't think much of that; it is something one does only when there is no structure" (Dallinger 2006).

Figure 15: Possible integration of further areas as well as lack of understanding for existing integration of sub-regions (author's diagram)



A clear delimitation also poses the question as to whether the region incorporates areas that certain groups of actors feel should perhaps be excluded. As shown in Figure 15, there were only a few municipalities that found it difficult to understand why the current borders had been chosen. Almost all of these were located within the urban agglomeration of the Upper Rhine axis. Specific mention was made of the relatively rural Neckar/Odenwald district and the southern and western Pfalz.¹²⁰ Municipalities in these districts understandably have a different view of the situation.¹²¹

As may be seen from Map 2, there are joint borders to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart in the south-east. The Neckar/Odenwald district regards itself as a connecting link fulfilling an important "hinge function as an interface" between the two metropolitan regions. It intends to use this connecting function to strengthen and further develop a large-scale network (Landratsamt Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis 2006: 12). The Hessian district of Bergstraße is also part of the Rhine/Main metropolitan region and thus with involvement in both regions inevitably has a hinge function (Wilkes 2005: 14). With the accreditation of the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region parts of the Rhineland-Palatine area around Landau would be integrated into both regions (Map 2). This special border situation, which is unique in Germany, offers the opportunity of creating an "association of south-west German metropolises of worldwide importance" (Specht 2005: 16). The Spatial Planning Association believes that in terms of number of residents and potential economic performance such a joining of forces, with the integration of Karlsruhe, would result in the critical mass required to "draw level" with Paris and London and to "play in the world league of metropolitan regions" (Raumordnungsverband 2005a: 18). According to W. König (2007: 98), the Bergstraße overlap has even resulted in long-term consideration of combining the Rhine/Main and Rhine/Neckar metropolitan regions.¹²² Internationally, the "Frankfurt brand" is very important, and an American investor would in any event not be interested in the administrative border between Frankfurt and Heidelberg (Dallinger 2006). Similar thoughts have also obviously occurred to the Federal Office for Building and Regional

¹²⁰ "It is not clear why the municipalities in the southern and western Pfalz should belong to the metropolitan region, although their functions within the association and their responsibilities are not known. Thus far, the functional connections are not clear" (Kandel).

¹²¹ "This question is only relevant for the edges. As Buchen lies on the fringes of the region (seen from Mannheim; seen from here, we are rather at the forefront), this question does not pose itself for us" (Buchen).

¹²² One thoroughly self-confident municipality did not assume a cooperative union, but recommended integrating Frankfurt into the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region: "perhaps the greater Frankfurt area as a European banking city should be included" (Waldbrunn).

Planning, as in the regional breakdown of metropolitan functions Heidelberg is listed under the Rhine/Main region (Adam et al 2005: 428). Due to this overlap, Hege and Torns (2007: 57) talk of a joint Rhine/Main/Neckar economic area, which is also perceived as being "one region" from the outside. A further intensification of the inter-connections and cooperation has resulted from the "knowledge region"¹²³ project.

According to M. König (2007: 68), a position in a border zone would normally constitute an "almost insurmountable obstacle to effective and constructive cooperation". Nevertheless, in this concrete case the integration of sub-regions from three states is primarily regarded as an opportunity and not as an obstacle. This can be partially explained by the over six hundred year-old history that the region shares and that expresses itself as a "common attitude to life" (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 17). Despite belonging to different states, there is a feeling of togetherness and a joint regional identity and awareness in the Rhine/Neckar region. In addition, it seems that the state borders have fuelled rather than damped the will to cooperate successfully. This has its roots in the industrialisation processes of the region, as the catchment areas of the industrial locations were not identical to the administrative borders, so that inter-municipal and regional cooperation was required from an early stage (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 17). A Rhine/Neckar regional spatial development plan was first published in 1962 and aimed at finding compromises between the potentially diverging goals of the various state development plans and programmes and compiling guiding principles for the spatial/functional development of the region. After more than 35 years of cooperation between three states and 279 municipalities, the region has come to regard itself as a "model for cooperative federalism" (Specht 2005: 16).


The municipalities involved also regard the involvement of three states mainly as an opportunity and not as an obstacle (Figure 16). Opportunities are mainly seen in improved cooperation, as well as in an over-arching regional identity, as the core area of the metropolitan region is more or less identical with the historical region of the Kurpfalz. In addition, a reduction in differences between state regulations and a better acceptance of inter-regional regulations are cited. Another factor mentioned is the notion that regional development occurs in economic regions that cannot be defined by federal state borders.¹²⁴ Municipalities that tend to see obstacles also emphasise differences in state regulations, although rather as an everyday problem, along with the increased need for agreement. In addition, parochial thinking at various levels including that of the three state governments, is often mentioned. The municipality of Maxdorf sees an interesting solution to the problem, as it proposes a rearrangement of the federal states, after which the metropolitan region would lie entirely within the borders of a new south-western state.¹²⁵ It is interesting to note that municipalities within the urban agglomeration areas see the state borders as posing more obstacles than rural municipalities do.

¹²³ The "knowledge region" project is aimed at improving framework conditions for research and business, as well as at a further development of the industrial and service location. In this regard, the Rhine/Main and Rhine/Neckar metropolitan regions have their own working groups which cooperate very closely (Hege, Torns 2007: 63 f.).

¹²⁴ "In the Europe of the future, the federal states will become less important and the economic regions more important. Economic and cultural links do not stop at federal borders" (Kandel).

¹²⁵ "State borders are always a handicap; 6 states should be sufficient and this would make Hesse, Rhineland-Palatine and Baden-Württemberg a single state" (Maxdorf).

Figure 16: Three federal states – opportunity or obstacle, as well as possible restriction of planning authority (author's diagram)



It seems likely that this tradition of long-term cooperation is at least part of the reason that there is “no fight between the three regional centres” (Dallinger 2006) and that the percentage of municipalities that can imagine a restriction in municipal planning authority is clearly higher than, for example, in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (Figure 16). A role is probably also played here by the familiarity of delegating authority to others caused by the “associative municipality” form found in Rhineland-Palatine, whereby smaller municipalities delegate some of their powers to the “main municipality”.

Some of the rural areas and areas on the periphery of the metropolitan regions feel less integrated.¹²⁶ In 2006 Dallinger found an information deficit among mayors of the smaller municipalities who were not on the relevant committees. This also emerged from the survey conducted among the municipal actors (Figure 19). The district councillor of the Neckar/Odenwald district, which has been allocated to the category of “rural areas in the narrower sense” by the Baden-Württemberg state development plan, suggested the establishment of a forum on “rural areas and fringe zones within the metropolitan region” to ensure the inclusion of the specific interests of rural areas in regional politics. Increased cooperation and the definition of similar interests could increase the political weight within the metropolitan region of the rural areas and the fringe zones of the urban agglomeration areas, even though there is no uniform “rural region” category due to the different spatial planning categories used by the three states involved. Overall, this should lead to all-round benefits (“we-situation”) due to the synergy effects of the “various talents” found within the metropolitan region (Neckar/Odenwald district office 2006: 8 ff.).


The great majority of municipalities envisages positive spill-over effects for areas outside the fixed borders of the metropolitan region (Figure 17). Most municipalities that fear an exacerbation of spatial disparities are smaller municipalities with a maximum of 4.999 residents.

Some of the municipalities did not at present wish to make a statement in this regard, as they felt it is too early for such an assessment.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ “Smaller municipalities give feedback along the lines of “don't forget the rural areas” (Dallinger 2006). Similarly Billigheim “the ‘hinterland’ is almost ignored”. And Haßmersheim “the decentralised involvement of the fringes must be improved – the metropolitan region does not end in Heidelberg”.

¹²⁷ This can only be evaluated once the metropolitan region has proved its own capacity and has generated advantages for the region (Buchen).

Figure 17: Assessment of the spill-over effects and support of growth engines (author's diagram)



7.2.6 Planning culture and metropolitan governance

In contrast to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, there are not only fixed spatial borders to the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region but also clearly regulated jurisdictions and responsibilities. The parties responsible are thus following the recommendations of Spannowsky, who as early as 2004 demanded that regional powers and skills should be clearly defined so as to further the development of regional cooperation. Based on the development of regional identity, the realisation of regionally important lighthouse projects can only be successful when "clear jurisdictions and rules of responsibilities support planning, implementation and control of the project success" (Spannowsky 2004: 34).

Aspects related to the politically legitimated representation of interests of the metropolitan region at federal or European level were not under discussion in this region, unlike in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. The Rhine/Neckar regional association represents the metropolitan region externally. Operational regional development, i. e. implementation in planning practice, takes place via the business centre of the association, the specially founded Rhein/Neckar Metropolitan Region Company, and the business centres of the chambers of trade and industry (Figure 12). Since 1 January 2007, the region has also been represented by its own office in Brussels. This is to ensure intensive contact with the relevant departments of the European Commission so that information about sponsorship programmes or tenders can be acquired at an early stage, and also to carry out targeted lobbying so that locational decisions are made that favour the metropolitan region. It is clearly more difficult for a cross-state region such as Rhine/Neckar to be represented by the various state offices than for a region such as Stuttgart, which lies entirely within a one federal state.

The organisational and spatial structure pursued by the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region implies a strategy that clearly differs from the approaches of the spatially fluid "multi-level governance structures" (Thierstein 2006, with reference to northern Switzerland) of numerous other metropolitan regions. The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region regards its "spatial-functional congruence" as a "trump-card of regional development" that may become a "model for cooperation" (Raumordnungsverband 2005: 4), in the same way as the "one-voice policy" (Mandel 2008: 138). This is currently being acknowledged by representatives of other metropolitan regions (Hein 2007; Steinacher 2008), even if Steinacher shows a certain amount of scepticism as to whether these advantages will be apparent in long-term planning practice.

7.2.7 Internal and external marketing

In the current institutionalisation phase, the metropolitan region is heavily involved in the internal disseminating of information, i.e. the municipalities¹²⁸ and residents¹²⁹ within the region are the focus of interest.

The "Newsletter of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region" has appeared twice a month since September 2006. This is not only sent to all members of the Society for the Future of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, but also to all those on the corresponding mailing list (e.g. to all mayors); it also appears on the internet portal of the metropolitan region and in the regional and transregional press. The newsletter not only fulfils the task of informing the public about the activities of the regional networks and about involvement in regional developments; it also serves as a "business card" with which the region maintains an supraregional presence (Lowack 2006: 1). A similar purpose is served by the region's internet portal, which offers a great deal of information ranging from a general description of the metropolitan region to aspects of economic development and cultural events to FAQ (frequently asked questions) for various groups of addressees. The FAQs, in particular, serve to convey the aims of metropolitan region in a rapid and comprehensible manner. Not only are general questions such as "What is a European metropolitan region"? Explained in a brief and comprehensible manner, but the same is true for issues such as "Why should I get involved in the region?" or "What use does the metropolitan region have for me as a resident/for me as an entrepreneur"? (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2008).

Every day, the Rhine/Neckar newspaper has one page headed "Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region", bearing current announcements about the metropolitan region (Dallinger 2006). The region's extremely differentiated media and newspaper landscape still constitutes a certain problem, however. There is no "independent and separate media system" for the region, which makes it difficult to disseminate policies via the media (König, M. 2007: 90 f.). In this way political and administrative subdivisions are still clearly recognisable.

While preparing the application for accreditation as a metropolitan region a logo was designed that has been used very consistently in all publicity; it is also used on public transport and by companies in the region.¹³⁰ The company MRN targets business owners, asking them to display the logo on their websites, business documentation or vehicles (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2008). The widespread use of the logo has helped to create an identity (Dallinger 2006). Even unique cultural events such as the special exhibition on "Mozart and the theatre" at the Kurpfalz museum in Heidelberg advertise with the slogan "in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region" (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006: 7).

This intensive publicity work has resulted in a significantly higher degree of familiarity with the metropolitan region concept being achieved within a relatively short period than was the case in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, even though the latter was


¹²⁸ "The most important task is that we should first introduce the metropolitan region and the new sponsorship tasks to the municipalities themselves. The municipalities and regional bodies are the sponsors of the association and must be convinced by the idea of the metropolitan region, that we can only go forward together, especially with a view to Europe" (2006 interview with Roland Schilling, mayor of the municipality of Schönbrunn and chairman of the local CDU fraction, quoted in König, M. (2007: 90).

¹²⁹ "Firstly, in the current phase, the main representation of interests is internally oriented, i.e. towards the institutions and residents of the region itself, and not towards the outside" (2006 interview with Wolf-Rainer Lowack, executive director of MRN, quoted by König, M. (2007: 90).

¹³⁰ Freight and construction companies use the logo, thus publicising the metropolitan region within and outside the region (Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006b: 1).

accredited much earlier (Chapter 6.8.2). Some 75 % of the residents were familiar with the concept of a metropolitan region in 2007 (Mandel 2008: 142) and 62 % of the municipalities felt sufficiently informed at the time of the survey. Nonetheless, 33 % of municipalities still found the information insufficient and 2 % felt that they had not been informed at all. It seems probable that the municipalities that failed to respond to this special question – almost 4 % – tended to feel rather less well informed.

Figure 18: Comprehensibility and transparency of the concept and level of information (author's diagram)



A correlation of the level of information with the size of municipality (Figure 18) showed a significant relationship between a lower level of information and smaller municipalities. Correlation with the regional categories revealed that all municipalities that felt fully informed were situated within the urban agglomeration areas, while all those that felt completely uninformed were in the rural areas.¹³¹ The ratio between adequately informed municipalities and less informed municipalities was balanced between the agglomeration and rural areas. There are no significant differences in the level of information between the various federal states. As was to be expected, the correlation analyses confirm that smaller municipalities and those in rural areas were those that tended to have difficulties understanding the concept. There were demands for simpler language, comprehensible to residents.¹³² The proportion of municipalities in Rhineland-Palatine that found the concept incomprehensible was also clearly higher than in Baden-Württemberg.

Nevertheless M. König (2007: 103) still regards the approach of the metropolitan region as an "elitist project" that needs the acceptance of the general population to become a "residents' project". Of relevance here is the criticism of the municipalities of Bad Dürkheim and Sinsheim, who suggest that press and publicity work aimed at the "normal resident" needs improvement.

7.2.8 Strategies for implementation and financing

It is hoped that designation as a metropolitan region will make it easier in future to obtain access to information channels (including the European Union) as well as to various networks (Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar 2006). An information advantage can be a decisive factor for the successful application and implementation of the metropo-

¹³¹ The information about the metropolitan region concept appears to be too "concerned with conurbations and doesn't hit home in the Neckar/Odenwald district" (Billigheim).


¹³² "Use simpler, more comprehensible (catchier) formulations, name concrete projects as examples, so that the residents can feel involved in the process. If even the municipal politicians do not know exactly what it is all about ..." (Offenbach an der Queich).

litan region concept. This, for example, applies to early knowledge of new subsidy programmes or projects. Lobbying work is being undertaken in this direction, along with the initiation of networks (e.g. for joint project applications) via the Brussels office. Cooperation with other economic areas is seen as being easier with metropolitan region status (Dallinger 2006).

Within the region itself the focus is on the implementation of projects that clearly add value for individual residents. The director of the VRRN regards clear and measurable objectives (e.g. increasing the number of apprenticeship training position by 25 %), combined with the corresponding strategies and evaluation, as important (Dallinger 2006).

The concrete implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice can involve drawing up guiding principles and/or carrying out lighthouse projects. The municipalities surveyed showed a slight preference for a combination of the two. Just under a third see drawing up guiding principles as the best implementation strategy, while 18% are in favour of executing lighthouse projects without general guiding principles. These results mirror the academic planning discussion about implementation strategies at the strategic and operational levels.

Figure 19: Preferred implementation strategies and assessment of the suitability of previous spatial planning concepts (author's diagram)



Some municipalities regarded neither guiding principles nor lighthouse projects as the optimal implementation strategy. They favoured concrete cooperation.¹³³

Even before the accreditation as a metropolitan region, the steering committee of the Future of the Rhine/Neckar Triangle initiative analysed the strengths and weaknesses of the region and used them to develop a "success profile". Apart from eliminating structural obstacles, the "charisma" of the region is to be increased by strengthening the "potentials for excellence", which are categorised as lighthouse projects (Landratsamt Neckar/Odenwald 2006: 4). The "potentials for excellence" are: Life science and health location No. 1 (extend leadership position), leading innovation think tank in Europe (network of universities and economic strength), dynamic industrial location of the future (e.g. the generation of new, intelligent solutions), modern life and leisure activities at the highest level (outstanding quality of life).

¹³³ "Guiding principles and lighthouse projects are about advertising. In the medium term, what is decisive is cooperation in the fields of business, research, education, culture, etc. where the municipalities can also focus their activities. Within a coordinated network, various municipalities will then take on various functions" (Kandel).

It is interesting to note that most of the municipalities were of the opinion that the objectives related to the designation of the European metropolitan regions (see Chapter 4 in this regard) could not have been achieved using the old spatial planning concepts.¹³⁴ The municipalities explain this negative attitude by referring to the lack of an overall strategy,¹³⁵ the inadequate integration of the economy into implementation strategies, and the ponderous bureaucracy involved in the spatial planning strategies that they were aware of. Much criticism is directed at the excessively rigid procedures, the lack of authority to implement specific approaches, as well as the "ACTIVE"¹³⁶ pursuit of objectives. In this case, it was only the metropolitan region designation that brought about a unified planning approach across administrative borders, which is very much welcomed.¹³⁷ In this context frequent criticism was directed at state responsibility for spatial planning, as this is seen as being problematic in border regions. Previous approaches to spatial planning are seen as not being particularly implementation-orientated, so that spatial planning is not trusted¹³⁸ to meet the challenges of the future adequately.¹³⁹

Municipalities in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region were mostly of the opinion that the metropolitan region concept did not endanger the spatial planning postulate of creating equal living conditions in all sub-regions. The 13 % who expressed concerns in this regard were opposed by 65 % who did not see the postulate as being particularly at risk or who saw it as not being at risk at all. Surprisingly, 23 % of municipalities in the urban agglomeration area saw the postulate as being at risk, as opposed to only 10 % of municipalities in rural areas (Figure 11).

Another challenge for the region is to harmonise the everyday obstacles to business efficiency, including those posed by political-administrative divisions. A "high-speed administration" is currently being put in place, which is to implement standardised regional regulations, e. g. standard regional credentials for artisans. Until now, a company that employed artisans and was active in the entire region required three different permits. Similar problems have occurred with regard to the three different state regulations regarding shopping hours, which continue to lead to a clear distortion of competitive conditions.¹⁴⁰ With the mobility options available today, intra-regional distance forms little of an obstacle. Differences in shopping hours thus cause buyer streams to be significantly diverted, which can lead to considerable loss of income for some (Dallinger 2006). The Rhine/Neckar Transport Association, which has successfully implemented a congruent short distance public transport system with a standardised timetable and standardised tariffs for the entire region, is regarded as a model case all over Germany (Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar 2005: 19).

At the moment financing of work on hand usually takes place via the VRRN and the Rhein/Neckar Metropolitan Region Company. Further project-related finance is received from municipalities and firms (Mandel 2008: 136).

¹³⁴ "New challenges require new concepts" (Rülzheim).

¹³⁵ "Spatial planning has thus far only highlighted partial aspects of the overall strategy" (Mosbach).

¹³⁶ Emphasised in the questionnaire by using capital letters (Eberbach).


¹³⁷ "In the past, the Spatial Planning Association has been too much preoccupied with itself" (Binau).

¹³⁸ "The spatial planning approach tends to be a (spatial) planning and design approach, especially supported by politics. The approach for progress and development is though within the jurisdiction of business. The latter must be more strongly integrated" (Dannstadt-Schauernheim).

¹³⁹ "The past has shown that very little can be changed by using the old structures" (Buchen).

¹⁴⁰ Thus, for example, there are different regulations about shopping on Sundays and the states have different arrangements for public holidays (Dallinger 2006).

Figure 20: Financing options and a possible reduction in subsidies outside the metropolitan regions (author's diagram)



The municipalities are hoping for subsidies from various sources. EU, federal and state subsidies were mentioned some 117 times. Levy-based financing by the municipalities involved was mentioned only 23 times, which means that in practice almost 60% of the municipalities do not regard themselves as having financial obligations. Project-orientated financing involving only those directly involved is definitely regarded with more enthusiasm. Most of the municipalities questioned regard subsidies for growth engines as justified in principle. The reasons given are the multiplier effects and the effectiveness of the money used. Some recommend, however, only start-up financing. As all the municipalities surveyed would profit from such subsidies, the rejection rate of 18% is rather surprising. Municipalities that rejected subsidies supported their opinions by referring to the already strong economy in these regions.

There were more varied opinions about the reduction in funding at other points that could result from a growth-orientated subsidy policy (Figure 20). Municipalities that did not express any reservations about this often mentioned the multiplier effects of the funds used, which would also have a positive effect on those areas receiving fewer direct subsidies. All municipalities that expressed reservations were aware that there is no more money available than before, which would logically lead to a reduction in funding in other areas.

Cooperation between the VRRN and the Stuttgart and Rhine/Main metropolitan regions, as well as with adjoining areas in the states of Baden-Württemberg, Rhineland-Palatine and Hesse, was laid down in the state contract dated July 2005 (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2005: 3). Project-related cooperation and joint lobbying for the interests of the metropolitan regions (e.g. via the Initiative for European Metropolitan Regions in Germany or METREX) is combined with "healthy competition" (Dallinger 2006) between the regions.

7.3 Summary and prognosis

In many ways the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region is a singular example of the implementation of the concept in planning practice. This was the first time in Germany that the accreditation procedure was initiated by regional actors, especially those in business, and was then later carried forward by the political level. Another unique feature are the inter-state cooperation and organisational structures, which show a close knit interweaving of public and democratically legitimised institutions with business actors. The metropolitan region thus serves as a model for business-initiated regional

development¹⁴¹ and as "best practice" for institutional and functional cooperation. Accreditation as a metropolitan region and the new organisational structure have led to significantly better visibility of the region externally as well as to a noticeable increase in regional cooperation internally (Mandel 2008: 141). Another clear difference from the implementation strategies of other metropolitan regions is the spatial/functional congruence that results from the complete avoidance of the "discussion about delimitations and jurisdictions".

The strong focus on economic aspects and the considerable influence of actors from business is sometimes criticised. The fears expressed are mainly related to the excessive weighting given to economic factors in comparison with environmental policy or social interests, as well as to the way in which decisions could be made when the opinions of economic and political actors diverge.

Due to the relatively short time span, further investigations are needed to be able to draw definite conclusions.

¹⁴¹ The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region introduced itself under the title of "Business-initiated regional development – the new way forward?" at the Euregia 2006 in Leipzig.

8 Areas outside accredited metropolitan regions

As may be seen from Map 2, areas outside the metropolitan regions of Baden-Württemberg take up approximately half of the area of the state, provided that the potential metropolitan region of Upper Rhine is excluded. If this potential metropolitan region is also included, then less than one third of the area of the state remains. In both cases, the spatial category "rural area" predominates outside the metropolitan regions (Table 5).

In south-western Germany there are two growth areas outside the inner metropolitan catchment areas. These are to be found in the Upper Rhine region (Chapter 8.1) and the Lake Constance region (Chapter 8.4.1). An adequate spatial development strategy for these dynamic economic areas, which already make a significant economic contribution, has, according to the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning, two main objectives: supporting the specific potential of the regions and cooperating and networking with the accredited metropolitan regions (MKRO 2006a: 16).

The qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the survey conducted among the mayors of the central places and the regional associations is given in Chapter 8.6. Individual statements are to be found in the discussion of the various regions, as is the evaluation of the survey conducted among the regional actors. The latter resulted in very interesting qualitative statements, although no statistical evaluation or representation was possible due to the low number of participants.¹⁴²

8.1 The potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region

Cross-border metropolitan catchment areas are increasingly gaining importance in Germany; this includes the trinational cooperation area on the Upper Rhine. When fleshing out the guiding principle it will therefore be important to determine the extent to which such areas can be integrated into the concept of European metropolitan regions (MKRO 2006: 710).

Point 6.2.3 of the 2002 State Development Plan of Baden-Württemberg concerns the spatial and state planning aim of developing the Upper Rhine European catchment area as a European metropolitan region. The term "European catchment area" was introduced in the state development plan and is derived from the term "European metropolitan region", which is used nationwide (Chapter 4.4). The aim is further development leading to accreditation as a metropolitan region (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: B64). Many regional development tasks are listed but especially noteworthy are the intensification of cross-border coordination and the harmonisation of planning(-instruments), as well as the development of the region as a European economic and research location, using its high economic, technological and academic potential (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: 46).

One of the special features of the Upper Rhine region is its cross-border, trinational location, which includes two different linguistic regions as well as internal and external EU borders. According to the state development plan of Baden-Württemberg, the potential metropolitan region includes, in Germany, the areas of Rhine/Neckar, Karlsruhe-Pforzheim, Offenburg, Freiburg and the tri-border region. If based on the territory covered by the Franco-German-Swiss Upper Rhine Conference then the potential

¹⁴² Only six regional associations lie outside the metropolitan regions. Of these, three returned a completed questionnaire. An expert interview was conducted with one regional director (Köhler 2007c). Notes taken during a lecture and supplemented by further questions were available to provide insight into another regional association (Hager 2007). Only the Upper Rhine/Lake Constance regional association did not respond to the questionnaire.

metropolitan region integrates the areas shown on Map 5; i. e. the Alsace region with the two départements Haut-Rhin and Bas-Rhin; the Swiss cantons of Basel-Stadt, Basel-Land, Solothurn, Jura and Aargau; the Baden-Württemberg urban and rural districts of Lörrach, Waldshut-Tiengen, Breisgau-Hochschwarzwald, Freiburg, Emmendingen, Ortenau, Rastatt, Baden-Baden and Karlsruhe; the Rhineland-Palatinate districts of Germersheim, Landau and the southern wine route, and the municipalities of Dahner Felsenland and Hauenstein from the south-western Palatinate district (BAK 2006: 15). This large-scale delimitation overlaps with the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (Chapter 7), the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart¹⁴³ (Chapter 6), the French metropol-

itan regions of Strasbourg/Ortenau (Chapter 8.2) and Réseau métropolitaine Rhin-Rhône, as well as the Swiss Metropolitan Region of Basel (Chapter 8.3). In addition, the potential metropolitan region of Upper Rhine integrates the three Eurodistricts Strasbourg/Ortenau, Freiburg/Centre and southern Alsace, as well as Basel and the entire growth area outside the metropolitan catchment areas around Freiburg. In the south, the districts of Lörrach and Waldshut-Tiengen integrate parts of the Upper Rhine/Lake Constance regional association, while the district of Konstanz forms part of the Lake Constance European catchment area (Chapter 8.4.1). With a total territory of 21 518 km², the Upper Rhine region would be – in terms of area – the largest metropolitan region with German accreditation (BAK 2006: 15).



Map 5: The potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region

Unlike the accredited metropolitan regions of Stuttgart and Rhine/Neckar, the "European dimension" must be taken into account in the case of the Upper Rhine region. This necessitates an innovative approach appropriate to the region's "pilot role" as a "laboratory of European cooperation" (Regionalverband

Südlicher Oberrhein 2004: 7). Despite the differing administrative structures, etc. the integration of the Alsace region is regarded as essential (Mungenast 2007). A metropolitan region limited entirely to the Baden side has indeed never been suggested, even though cross-border cooperation continues to encounter barriers stemming from national regulations (Frey 2002: 136). On the other hand, as a border region, the Upper

¹⁴³ This only applies if the State Development Plan delimitation including the area around Pforzheim is taken as a basis.

Rhine region received EUR 67 million from the INTERREG IV A, some of which will be used for promoting the location as a metropolitan region (Hager 2007).

Even before the Upper Rhine Conference was established in 1991, models of transnational cooperation had been developed in this area. These days the overarching Upper Rhine Conference constitutes an executive information and coordination forum that deals with regionally significant matters of cross-border interest. However, cross-border institutional cooperation is also evident in numerous, small-scale organised structures such as may be seen in the three existing Eurodistricts, as well as in the TriRhena trinational region with its cooperation platform: the municipally influenced TriRhena regional council. Equally, the Pamina special-purpose regional association in the northern part of the Upper Rhine region is mainly aimed at joint spatial development, while the consortium Centre acts as a forum for cross-border cooperation in the central Upper Rhine region. The Upper Rhine Council was established in 1997 and serves as a forum for improving cooperation at political level between mandate holders of the Upper Rhine Region (DIFU 2004: 70). Cooperation with three different cultures is still difficult but essential, as borders continue to diminish in importance (Hager 2007). Frey (2002: 138) views the barrier and filter effects of political borders as obstacles to development, but at the same time predicts that border regions could be among the growth regions of the future, as they still have unused development potential.

The state development plan aims for the development of the Upper Rhine European catchment area as a "European model region for cross-border handling of ecological and economic challenges" (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: B65). The Baden-Württemberg state parliament therefore welcomes the initiative of the Upper Rhine Council in trying to turn the Upper Rhine region into a European metropolitan region (Landtag von Baden-Württemberg 2005a: 2), and views the Upper Rhine region as a "test case" for European integration. With appropriate modifications it should be possible to transfer efficient planning and decision-making modules to other European areas (Landtag Baden-Württemberg 2006: 78).

On the French side, both the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict (Chapter 8.2), which lies completely within the Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region, and the Réseau métropolitaine Rhin-Rhône, which partially overlaps with it, are recognised as metropolitan regions. A survey of experts suggested that the Rhine/Rhône city network is not of international significance but is of relatively high European, national and regional importance. However, 44% of the experts were unable to give an opinion on this region at all (Kaltenegger 2006: 173).

The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR 2005: 185) regards the Upper Rhine region as having all the qualities required for a cross-border European metropolitan region, despite the fact that – with the exception of Freiburg – the influential centres of Strasbourg, Basel and Zurich lie outside the state borders. The Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning believes however that in the context of an open Europe these metropolitan functions are easily accessible. A report assessing the suitability of the Upper Rhine region as a potential metropolitan region showed that its economic capacity is comparable to that of other metropolitan regions. This report (BAK 2006: 53) lists the European Confederation of Upper Rhine Universities (EUCOR),¹⁴⁴ BioValley¹⁴⁵ and cross-border transport associations as bi- and trinational

¹⁴⁴ EUCOR displays essential elements of a cross-border, networked educational and research system.

¹⁴⁵ A network of manufacturing companies, R&D institutions, supplier and logistics companies in the field of life sciences.

model lighthouse projects. With 15 000 scientists, 160 research institutions, 12 universities, considerable subsidies and 150 companies with almost 2.000 jobs being established between 1997 and 2002, the international significance of the BioValley biocluster is obvious (Nonn et al 2005: 150 f.).

The weaknesses of this region are the low proportion of business services and the political-administrative fragmentation, which persists despite moves towards becoming a common economic area. Within this region, which Hager (2007) terms "artificial", there is as yet no established cooperation, which also makes it difficult to form an external identity. It seems clear that joint locational marketing is required, as there is no dominant metropolis that can represent the region in the internal market. Despite the specially created website, there is still no "common contact person and no clear definition of goals" (BAK 2006: 48), while the "diffuse newspaper landscape" constitutes another impeding factor (Mungenast 2007). Further networking potential that would strengthen the region is to be found in joint tourism marketing, transport infrastructure, national educational structures and the extension of linguistic knowledge (BAK 2006: 53). Apart from the general problems of transnational cooperation, the non-EU membership of Switzerland further complicates cross-border decision-making processes (Frey 2002: 137).

The establishment of another metropolitan region in Baden-Württemberg, especially one of such a large area and in many respects so heterogeneous, has met with a certain amount of criticism. Sinz (2007a: 25) asks whether the term "metropolitan region" is suitable in this case and whether it accurately describes the potential of the region. He argues that the Upper Rhine region fails to fit into the German concept of metropolitan regions because of the non-existent metropolitan centre; fails to fit into the Swiss concept because of its size; and the French have doubts about accreditation by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Sinz 2007).

Gust (2006) even fears a "dislocation" of the metropolitan region concept in Baden-Württemberg if such a region stretches from Weinheim to Basel. Even representatives of the Upper Rhine region have expressed scepticism, as the Upper Rhine lacks a strong regional movement comparable to the Rhine/Neckar and has no clear dominant metropolis. In addition, marketing for such a large region is difficult and it is unlikely that short-term a third metropolitan region in Baden-Württemberg will be accredited (Hager 2007). On the other hand, the establishment of the first cross-border metropolitan region in Germany is seen as offering opportunities, particularly as the Upper Rhine is mentioned in Guiding Principle 1 (MKRO 2006: 710) as a "cross-border metropolitan catchment area of increasing importance". There is some lobbying in this regard at the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (Hager 2007). The Ministry for Economic Affairs in Baden-Württemberg also favours a cross-border cooperation area that extends from Karlsruhe to Basel. The notion of a "large metropolitan region" from Mannheim to Lörrach is no longer being pursued, in order not to "disturb Mannheim". The establishment of a smaller metropolitan region in the Freiburg area is also not a current option (Schulze 2006) and the further development of TriRhena would not correspond to the Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region (Sinz 2007).

To deal with concrete local implementation, an ad-hoc working group "Metropolitan Region" was established by the Upper Rhine Conference. This initiative was taken up by the three German regional associations involved and marketed to the chambers of industry and commerce and to business (Mungenast 2007). Implementation is not to be carried out by a new institution but through projects, as Hager (2007) already complains there is an "over-furnishing" of committees. In an initiative committee representatives

from the municipalities, the three Eurodistricts, business, research, cultural institutions and tourism work together, assisted by experts who give project-specific advice. Prominent project partners are being recruited according to the Voscherau example (Chapter 7). Lighthouse projects are intended to communicate implementation to the wider population. An application has also been submitted for a Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning, and a presentation given in Brussels (Hager 2007). The Southern Upper Rhine regional association suggests that normal spatial planning instruments are not adequate to cope with the participation of several planning regions from various countries, and suggests that the establishment of functioning structures of cooperation in addition to lighthouse projects and guiding principles is decisive. In January 2008, a joint statement was signed by representatives of all three countries, stipulating the ongoing procedure to be followed to create a trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region (Trinational Congress 2008).

Among the municipalities within the German part of the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region there is substantial awareness of the region and its possible positioning. In a survey conducted among the central places, the majority of municipalities from the Upper Rhine region who responded felt that they belonged to this trinational metropolitan region. The municipalities appeared to be well aware of the current status, as in some cases the state development plan was quoted.¹⁴⁶ If the region should be accredited as a metropolitan region, the existing committees (Upper Rhine Conference, Upper Rhine Council) should be incorporated into the new EMR structure (Karlsruhe), while at the same time guarding against the establishment of too many planning and consulting levels. The future development of this region remains an open question.

8.2 The Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict

Unlike the metropolitan regions of Stuttgart and Rhine/Neckar (Chapters 6 and 7), Strasbourg was included in the map for Guiding Principle 1 as "another location with metropolitan functions" but the Eurodistrict Strasbourg/Ortenau is not a metropolitan region recognised by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning. It should be noted that the Eurodistrict concept cannot be compared to the German metropolitan region concept, as the basic aims differ (Chapter 4). However, the Strasbourg/Ortenau district successfully responded to the call of DATAR, the French spatial planning authorities, to participate in metropolitan cooperation (Chapter 4.3) and has thus – including the German sub-region – become a French metropolitan region (BAK 2006: 9).

The fact that the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict lies completely within the potential trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region makes the spatial situation and the interconnections even more complicated. Due to the special status of the Eurodistrict, a separate survey was conducted among the mayors of this region. Far more responses were received from the German side than from the French side. Twelve questionnaires were completed in full, a total that gives some insight into tendencies but is not sufficient to calculate percentages. However, the comments included with the questionnaires and the expert interview with the mayor of Kappelrodeck, Klaus Mungenast are revealing for the investigation.

¹⁴⁶ "7+4 according to the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning is final in Germany, but the Upper Rhine European catchment area is to be treated like a metropolitan region" (city of Lörrach).

8.2.1 The current situation within the urban agglomeration area

The urban agglomeration area is dominated by Strasbourg, the largest city, which plays an increasingly important role both at European level (as the seat of the European Council, the European Parliament and the European Court of Human Rights), and within the French urban system. The changes in political framework conditions of recent years have been very positive for Strasbourg, as the opening of the borders and the EU internal market have transformed its peripheral border location into one increasingly central to Europe. The creation of the cross-border Eurodistrict in October 2004 further strengthened the position of Strasbourg and has resulted in a clear increase in residents and jobs, as well as in a more dynamic economy and growing innovation potential (Wendel 2004: 600). However Bachmann (2005: 348) still sees Strasbourg's position in the national border region as being a disadvantage in international competition with other business locations. Transnational cooperation is an attractive prospect for the French as Strasbourg can only carry out its nodal function as a regional centre and thus requires the German hinterland (Hager 2007).

The weaknesses of this agglomeration region on the French side are linked mostly to its low demographic weighting. Indeed, Vanier (2005: 159) believes that Strasbourg cannot function as a European metropolis because of its small size. The neighbouring French municipalities have almost no metropolitan functions. A further weakness is international transport links, due to the border location of the city, although the opening in 2007 of the TGV connection to Paris has considerably improved matters on the French side. Hamann (2005: 106) sees an additional problem in the clear imbalance between the partners Strasbourg and Kehl.

On the German side the regional centre of Offenburg is the largest city, but with its 58 000 residents it has no metropolitan functions. The district of Ortenau is very rural, especially its eastern section, and is of importance mostly as a tourist destination. The current state development plan of Baden-Württemberg allocates in Paragraph 6.2.3.3 special regional development tasks to the Offenburg area on the basis of the city's "development function within the Upper Rhine European catchment area" and its proximity to the European city of Strasbourg (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: 48). One of these tasks, the development of a cross-border partnership with the Strasbourg area, has been executed by the creation of the Eurodistrict. The EU internal market has placed the Ortenau district in a central position within the EU, whereas before it was considerably disadvantaged by its peripheral position at the German border (BMVBS 2008: 26).

Events of the past have resulted in multiple interconnections between the Ortenau districts and the sub-districts of Alsace, even though links were completely cut off during the two world wars and strictly limited for a long time thereafter. Even today, there are deficits in the relationship between east and west, as central place networks tend not to cross the Rhine. Thus far, only the Strasbourg/Kehl axis is well-established. Unlike other transnational regions, the Eurodistrict has an "absolutely atypical pattern of movements": not only is the Strasbourg commuter belt restricted to the French hinterland, but there are also "reverse border commuter streams", i. e. from Strasbourg into the Ortenau district. The reason for this is differences in salaries in the two countries (ADEUS 2004: 26).

8.2.2 The Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict

The Eurodistrict includes the Ortenau district on the German side and the Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg on the French side. In total, 51 German and 139 French municipalities have been integrated.

The establishment of the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict is based on a joint statement by the German chancellor and the French president, made on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Elysée agreement on 22 January 2003. This statement referred to an intensification of cross-border cooperation, research into new forms of cooperation¹⁴⁷, the execution of projects with "special European added value", the incorporation of European institutions, and a reduction in the restrictions the border situation causes on the everyday life of the population (Eurodistrikt Strasbourg/Ortenau undated: 2). The state of Baden-Württemberg regards the Eurodistrict as a "future workshop for the development of new forms of cooperation (Landtag Baden-Württemberg 2006: 63). Indeed, three years earlier Guigou (2000: 68) called for an intensification of relations between Strasbourg and the centres of Karlsruhe and Mannheim in Baden.

The Eurodistrict is to be a "pilot region for ongoing integration in border regions" within the European Union. The aim is to achieve corresponding recognition from the European Union and legal and financial support from the various political institutions in France and Germany (Eurodistrikt Strasbourg/Ortenau undated: 4). Hamann (2005: 105) interprets the Eurodistrict as a kind of "communauté urbaine transfrontalière",¹⁴⁸ the concrete legal and management structure of which is still unclear. The decision-making body of the Eurodistrict is the Eurodistrict Council, which consists of elected representatives of the local regional bodies. A coordination group consisting of administrators from the state parliament and the city of Strasbourg coordinates the functional work. On the French side, the city of Strasbourg is the dominant member, with five of a total of seven votes, while on the German side the distribution of votes is more even, with five larger cities, one smaller municipality and the district councillor of the Ortenau district (Mungenast 2007). In the medium term, the Eurodistrict could develop into a separate, cross-border administrative authority or regional body (Landtag Baden-Württemberg 2006: 64). Financing takes place via the various bodies responsible for the projects, with all regional bodies being involved in applications for co-financing (e.g. via the European Union).

The working basis for the Eurodistrict is a White Paper (ADEUS 2004) that recommends themes of future relevance, joint objectives and concrete projects through which these objectives are to be realised. This White Paper is also to provide the basis for the revision of regional planning documentation (Regionalplan for the Southern Upper Rhine and Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale for the Strasbourg Region).

Almost three years after its establishment, the municipalities see the Eurodistrict as having improved their cross-border cooperation, as having helped the region to grow together and as having improved positioning in relation to its European competitors. All municipalities expect further advantages from the transnational metropolitan region accreditation (e.g. better international visibility and additional subsidies), although in this context the larger area of the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region was often mentioned.

¹⁴⁷ Chirac referred to this as a "test kitchen": http://www.eurodistrict.com/de/downloads/grundlagentext_de.pdf.

¹⁴⁸ In this regard, Hamann refers to the French municipal associations, which regulate matters of transmunicipal cooperation such as refuse or waste water disposal, etc.

With the exception of two municipalities, all respondents regarded the fixed administrative delimitation of the Eurodistrict as adequate. They supported this opinion with reference to the connection of the region to a concrete institution and the clear allocation of actors. The two municipalities that did not share this opinion both have existing transnational partnerships outside the Eurodistrict. A narrow majority of respondents think that the integration of additional areas would be useful, most mentioned the district around the Alsace Erstein.¹⁴⁹ It is interesting to note that as well as mentioning the settlement three times, the White Paper (ADEUS 2004: 10 f.) regards Erstein as lying within the Eurodistrict, although according to the European report of Baden-Württemberg this is not the case (Landtag Baden-Württemberg 2006: 64). The French municipality of Ostwald, on the other hand, wants the Eurodistrict to be better established before territorial expansion is considered.

The municipalities almost unanimously rejected changing the district area by excluding municipalities, the integration of which appeared not to be justified. Only the city of Lahr could imagine a different region: "For reasons of pragmatism, the ED is composed of two institutionalised units", the *Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg* and the *Ortenau* district. "If one wanted to get away from this and create an "ideal layout" for the ED, it would be necessary to increase its size to the north and south on the French side and decrease it on the German side by cutting out the Black Forest municipalities in the eastern part of the *Ortenau* district". Only the French municipality of Lipsheim could imagine working with a network structure, all the other municipalities rejected this idea, mainly because of the lack of transparency and the necessity of repeatedly finding new cooperation partners.

None of the German municipalities could imagine restrictions being placed on their planning authority in favour of planning at metropolitan level. If this were to take place at all, then metropolitan planning should serve as an addition and an enrichment. Only the city of Lahr was able to imagine that certain cross-border tasks could at some stage in the future be taken over by an institutionalised Eurodistrict.¹⁵⁰ In contrast, the French municipality of Ostwald refers to the *Schémas de cohérence territoriale* (SCOT), by which provision is made for responsibility for regional planning to shift from municipal level to a higher level.¹⁵¹ Indeed, it should be noted that France generally strongly promotes inter-municipal cooperation, for instance by setting up large-scale regional associations (DIFU 2004: 111), which are then also responsible for transcommunal planning tasks. A joint regional or land use plan is regarded as desirable, albeit as unrealistic. Actually the German side has the impression that in Alsace it is much easier to designate a commercial area. This results in undesirable intraregional competition, as does the Factory Outlet Centre built in Oppenheim (Mungenast 2007).

According to the municipalities the Eurodistrict is mainly to be financed by subsidies provided by the European Union as well as the state of Baden-Württemberg and Alsace region, followed by project-orientated financing or a national subsidy programme. Only one municipality mentioned the possibility of levy-based financing by the municipalities. In contrast to the German/French metropolitan region of Sarrebruck/Moselle Est,

¹⁴⁹ "Without this, the German south of the ED does not have a counterpart on the left bank of the Rhine in the ED and one uses other forms of cooperation" (Lahr).

¹⁵⁰ Lahr actually states: "The municipalities are the engines of the ED and should not give up this function by losing planning options in favour of new structures. However, at a later stage, it is thinkable that additional, cross-border tasks and jurisdictions be taken on by the then institutionalised ED".

¹⁵¹ "confère le SCOT en France – on ne peut plus raisonner à l'échelle de la ville, mais à l'échelle du bassin ou de la conurbation" (Ostwald 2007).

where the German side also receives subsidies from the French state (Kühne 2007), this is not the case in the Ortenau district (Mungenast 2007).

With the exception of Sasbachwalden, all municipalities regard support of the growth engines as justified. Sasbachwalden expressed fears regarding the marginalisation of non-integrated regions.¹⁵² The majority of municipalities believed that subsidising the growth engines could lead to a scarcity of financial resources in other places.

The degree of information available about the Eurodistrict seems to vary. Either the municipalities felt sufficiently informed or felt that they were less informed or not informed at all; the middle category was not mentioned at all. One possible explanation is that the larger municipalities were well informed, as they were all involved in the Eurodistrict council, whereas the smaller Black Forest municipalities were less well informed. The larger municipalities thus also judged the level of integration in the implementation process as adequate, whereas the smaller municipalities wished for greater integration. Mungenast (2007) confirmed the notion that only the mayors involved in the relevant committees are familiar with the various terms and concepts.

Only one small Black Forest municipality expected to gain no advantages from the Eurodistrict. The issue of questioning the postulate of equal living conditions for all was judged differently by the large settlements, which did not see this as a danger, and the smaller municipalities, which definitely regard it as being so. The effects on areas outside the Eurodistrict (spill-over effects) were regarded as overwhelmingly positive by the municipalities.

The municipalities regard the concept of a Eurodistrict as being well suited for stimulating economic growth, speeding up European integration and coping with the consequences of demographic change (Figure 21). Surprisingly, the Eurodistrict approach is not regarded as suitable for successfully coping with the effects of globalisation. The municipalities regard the concept as limited for the purposes of furthering environmental protection or guaranteeing sustainable development, but as still less suitable for the intensification of cooperation between the various planning levels and for the purposes of increasing integration of the population into the processes of planning practice. This is surprising, given that the binational Eurodistrict council was almost unanimously regarded as positive and that there were hardly any recommendations for extending the circle of actors.

8.2.3 The French Metropolitan Region of Strasbourg/Ortenau

As early as 1995 Guigou demanded more attention and support to be extended to the Strasbourg/Freiburg/Mulhouse/Basel metropolitan region, both on the part of the French state and on the part of the European Union. He regards the city of Strasbourg as the "head" of a central European urban network profiting from transnational dynamics, but still requiring support from France.

Within the framework of the reorientation of French spatial planning policy (Chapter 3.4), it was decided on 7 April 2005 to allow the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict, i. e. including the German areas, to participate in DATAR's call for cooperation between the metropolises (Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict, undated: 2). The request was approved, i. e. the Eurodistrict is now one of the accredited French metropolitan regions. Thus the steps described in Chapter 4.3 now have to be taken. In this case there is the problem,

¹⁵² "There will definitely be changes. Those who have not jumped on the bandwagon will be left behind" (Sasbachwalden 2007).

however, that the multiple layers of Eurodistrict, metropolitan region and SCOT,¹⁵³ all of which assume intermunicipal cooperation processes, are regarded as confusing by the local politicians responsible (Touche 2006a: 8). The city of Lahr even has the impression that the "French state has already lost interest in the subject of metropolitan regions".

In a survey of experts, the Metropolitan Region of Strasbourg/Ortenau was given the same degree of importance within the European and national contexts. One third of the experts, however, were unable to estimate the significance of the region at all (Kaltenegger 2006: 78). Sinz (2007) rather regards the Strasbourg/Ortenau area as a "regiopolis".

8.2.4 Metropolitan projects

Although Strasbourg, with its "European dimension", may have high potential, the actual weight of the city internationally does not yet correspond to its institutional status. Better positioning of Strasbourg within the national and international context, strengthening of its position as an international metropolis, and reinforcement of its function as a "European city" are thus of great significance for the entire region (motor function) (ADEUS 2004: 28). A decisive factor in this regard could be the planned development of Strasbourg into a second mainstay of EU administration. Paal (2005: 13), however, questions the extent of the city's opportunities. In April 2003 the French government set up a "steering committee for the European city of Strasbourg", which was to attempt to improve the position of the metropolis by attracting other European institutions to locate there and by emphasising the advantages of Strasbourg's now central position in Europe (ADEUS 2004: 30). In this context a "step-by-step integration of the Strasbourg/Ortenau region into a cross-border metropolitan region" appears to be of particular significance, especially in view of the specific problems engendered by the transnational situation (Chapter 8.2.5) (ADEUS 2004: 40).

The Eurodistrict is at a significant interface of the Paris to Budapest rail route that forms part of the trans-European network, as this is where the French and German high-speed railway networks (TGV and ICE) need to connect. The aim is to ensure rapid execution. To further build up the hitherto inadequate east/west relations, axes of cooperation are to be developed across the Rhine (ADEUS 2004: 29). In July 2008 a new Rhine bridge was opened near Kehl. More intensive economic cooperation has been agreed, as has an earnest attempt to harmonise taxation. In addition, comparable institutions are to cooperate more intensively. One example of such possible cooperation is between the two adjoining harbours of Kehl and Strasbourg, who as yet have no joint projects (ADEUS 2004: 46). Another example is the three airports of Strasbourg, Lahr and Söllingen, which are partly in direct competition with one another.

A "Eurodistrict" university centre is to be established for educational and research purposes, with new courses being developed to dual degree level. The White Paper (ADEUS 2004) lists a total of 25 concrete projects that are to be used to achieve the coherent and future-orientated development of the entire region. The projects include both concrete infrastructure (e.g. an extension of the Strasbourg/Kehl east-west axis) and "experimental fields" such as joint, cross-border planning that is to be innovative in terms of content, concepts and organisation, or a "joint living space", to be created by supporting municipal partnerships, dual-language signs and a joint logo for the Strasbourg/Ortenau region, etc.

¹⁵³ Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale in the Strasbourg region.

The vast majority of the municipalities regarded lighthouse projects as essential for implementation. The compilation of guiding principles was seldom mentioned, which might, of course, have to do with the fact that a comprehensive White Paper already exists.

8.2.5 Special challenges for the transnational metropolitan region

Even the compilation of the White Paper and the preparatory study met with many difficulties: language barriers; different planning regions, planning specifications and planning systems; different legal bases, administrative structures and spatial divisions; and a lack of comparability of the information and data available. This was compounded by differences in priorities and in actual problems. On the other hand, there were already transnational documents available, e.g. the spatial planning orientation framework for the Upper Rhine Conference area and a joint concept for the development of open space (ADEUS 2004: 12 f.). The participation of municipal representatives as well as actors from politics, business and education was ensured by holding a workshop and providing the opportunity to make recommendations for the compilation of the White Paper.

To take into account the real interconnections in this transnational area of cooperation, the relevant spatial categories in the national planning documentation are also to be shown crossing the borders. ADEUS (2004: 31) therefore requests that the city of Kehl be allocated to a cross-border conglomeration of Strasbourg/Kehl for state planning purposes.

Despite the opening of borders and free movement of goods traffic, it has emerged that in a highly integrated region borders still constitute "very important, invisible obstacles". In this context, ADEUS (2004: 36) quoted a study by Veltz,¹⁵⁴ which shows a reduction in German/French goods traffic to one tenth due to the historical perception of the border. The situation in this case is exacerbated by the fact that the Rhine is a real geographical obstacle (there are only four bridges and one ferry within the Eurodistrict). In addition there are real language barriers, especially among the 20–40 year olds in Alsace (Mungenast 2007), a situation that has been worsened by the rejection of French as first compulsory foreign language on the Baden side.¹⁵⁵ The municipalities also hope for a reduction in border-related obstacles as well as the facilitation of daily life. Overall, ADEUS (2004: 38) found that both the Strasbourg and the Ortenau regions have thus far functioned according to their own individual logics and have used their respective locational advantages "without really pursuing a joint strategy". Thus rather than orientating itself according to neighbourly cooperation, Strasbourg tends to take its cue from European metropolises of the same or higher rank; ADEUS (2004: 40) regards the situation in Offenburg as being similar.

Kunzmann (2001: 114) is rather sceptical, suggesting that France and Germany will continue along different spatial planning routes for decades to come. Hamann (2005: 107 f.) regards current transnational cooperation within the Eurodistrict as a process of "trial and error". One factor is that conditions differ as a result of the German municipal reform of the 1970s, for which there was no equivalent in France. There is thus an imbalance in the number of municipalities: 51 German municipalities in comparison with 139 French municipalities, some of which are very small.

¹⁵⁴ Veltz, P. (1999): Comment améliorer la performance économique des territoires, contributions aux 3èmes entretiens de la Caisse des Dépôts sur le développement local.

¹⁵⁵ Judgement of the Mannheim Administrative Court dated 25/07/2007.

The municipalities surveyed also saw various difficulties resulting from transnationality, even though they all – with the exception of the Alsace municipality of Lipsheim, which failed to respond to this question – regarded the integration of two national states in the Eurodistrict as representing an opportunity. The reason mostly given for this was the possibility of learning from each other and developing mutual understanding. Despite such opportunities, the municipality of Seelbach also regards implementation as being handicapped by "different political and administrative cultures, as well as by differing degrees of municipal independence (centralism in France)". In terms of strategies for dealing with the challenges of transnational cooperation, the municipalities mentioned in particular getting to know the various framework conditions and then where necessary adapting them or compiling regulations. Personal contacts and the acquisition of language skills were regarded as essential. Official meetings always require translation, rendering cooperation difficult and resulting in considerable costs. Unofficial meetings are mostly carried out in the Alsatian dialect, which is currently undergoing a renaissance. It is interesting to note that this means that older people tend to be more integrated, while the generation between the ages of 20 and 40 experiences more problems (Mungenast 2007). Only the municipality of Schuttrertal in the Black Forest did not regard itself as being confronted with such challenges.¹⁵⁶

8.3 The metropolitan regions of Northern Switzerland and their spatial catchment areas

The issue of metropolitan regions in Switzerland is complex, as even experts disagree on the number of such regions in existence. While the Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE) names five metropolitan regions, there are also those who are of the opinion that there are only two metropolitan regions of "European scale". These would be the greater Zurich area, which would integrate areas from Basel to eastern Switzerland, including parts of southern Baden-Württemberg and the area around Lake Geneva (Arc Lémanique).¹⁵⁷ Wegelin (2007), on the other hand, mentions three metropolitan regions, as he classifies Bern and the Ticino regions merely as large-scale catchment areas. It is clear that the metropolitan regions in Switzerland are not yet of a magnitude such that their status is unquestioned (Kaltenegger 2006: 89 f.). Nonetheless, Swiss experts see the metropolitan regions as being very important for economic development and assume that the topic will gain in significance in the next few years even if, in their opinion, too little is currently being done to support the metropolitan regions. Almost all Swiss experts (92 %) regard it as impossible that additional metropolitan regions may develop in Switzerland in the future. Only 23 % of them, however, deem it impossible that regions could lose their metropolitan region status through failing to fulfil the conditions, while 62 % regard this as possible (Kaltenegger 2006: 119).

The interconnections in the north-west area of Switzerland (trinational metropolitan region of Basel) are the most complex in what is in any case an extremely fragmented country (Chapter 3.4). In addition to the cantons of Basel Stadt, Basel Land and parts of the cantons of Solothurn, Aargau and Jura, the Basel Metropolitan Region includes the French cantons of Ferrette, Huningue and Sierentz, and the German district of Lörrach. The entire Basel metropolitan area as defined by the Swiss Federal Statistics Office lies within the borders of the Upper Rhine region (BAK 2006: 12). Parts of the trinational Basel agglomeration have joined the French Réseau métropolitaine Rhin-Rhône (BAK

¹⁵⁶ "I do not see a single point where that would concern us" (Schuttrertal 2007).

¹⁵⁷ Unimagazin 02/2005: Interview with H. Leuthold and M. Herrmann, Geographical Institute of the University of Zurich, cited by Kaltenegger 2006: 89.

2006: 12), whose territory overlaps with the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region. The trinational Basel Eurodistrict was established in January 2007 (Landesportal Baden-Württemberg, 29/01/2007). Due to the very small size of the core cantons (Basel Stadt 37 km², Basel Land 315 km²), Basel relies on transnational cooperation for any expansion, e. g. of the biocluster (Nonn et al 2005: 154 f.). However, in particular on the French side, the idea of a cross-border region was initially met with scepticism and was regarded as "Basel-style colonialism" (Speiser 1993: 32 in Frey 2002: 134).

In addition to the spatial interconnections, institutional interconnections have also reached an almost incomprehensible degree of complexity. The association TAB (Trinationale Agglomeration Basel) was established in 2002 to coordinate spatial planning. A trinational neighbourhood conference that deals with important regional subjects has been in existence since 2000 (BAK 2006: 33). In addition, there is in the trinational region the Regio TriRhena with the TriRhena regional council as a cooperation platform for municipalities. In April 2008, the association "metrobasel" was established as an umbrella organisation for groups of actors from politics, business and the civilian population in the Basel area. The "internationally effective" name of this new association was supposed to signify the "metropolitan strength" of the trinational Basel economic area (MetroBasel 2008).

The Basel Metropolitan Region describes itself as "probably the most fragmented and most politically divided metropolitan region in Europe" (metrobasel 2008). Frey (2002: 131) describes the convoluted nature of the regions as the "Babushka principle". The state and language barriers are still perceived as "tangible barriers" and the region is not really regarded as a unit with Basel as a clearly recognised centre. Language barriers are currently actually increasing, as young people prefer to learn English instead of French or German as a foreign language. There is a trend away from the trinational job market towards a binational, single-language German/Swiss job market (Hicklin 2006: 8 f.). This extreme fragmentation is seen as a considerable risk, as it may prevent the region achieving the critical mass in, for example, central place functions and the creation of an integrated regional internal market. This may in turn result in disadvantages in global locational competition. Trinational coordination of spatially effective planning and a strengthening of regional identity (e. g. with a directly elected Eurodistrict parliament with the power to promote trinational projects) are also required. In this context a vision of "metrobasel 2020" was submitted in 2006 (metrobasel 2006). It is interesting to note that neither participation in a potential trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region nor in a "Greater Zurich" Metropolitan Region is mentioned in this vision. Only partial cooperation in order to develop lobbying strategies for the regions is seen as possible (metrobasel 2006: 16). Thierstein (2006), on the other hand, does not regard Basel as an independent metropolitan region, but as a sub-region of the Zurich Metropolitan Region.

The dominance of Basel as a core city is not as clear as would be expected from the economic and commuter figures, as significant differences in the cost of living lead to a considerable flow of purchasing power to southern Baden and Alsace (Frey 2002: 132). This is also a reason why many commuters prefer not to move their place of residence to Switzerland.

Due to this extreme fragmentation, Wegelin (2007) considers territorial reform to be essential. In his opinion, the community of responsibility cannot be realised in any other way, as the core metropolis will hardly take over responsibility for the fringe areas on a voluntary basis. The particularly special feature here is that the community of responsibility is trinational, which clearly exacerbates the problems discussed in Chapter 5.3.4.

Experts surveyed mostly regarded the Basel Metropolitan Region as being of European and national significance. Despite the world market leaders in the pharmaceutical industry that are located here, very few experts regarded the area as being of international importance (Kaltenegger 2006: 91). The same expert survey saw the Zurich Metropolitan Region as having a very high degree of international and European importance (Kaltenegger 2006: 91). In Switzerland, Zurich is by far the dominant metropolitan region (see Thierstein 2006). Although the catchment area for the Zurich Metropolitan Region also includes parts of southern Baden-Württemberg, these areas have not thus far been concretely integrated. For instance, Zurich has started a demonstration project that is concerned with the process of metropolitan consultation (Wegelin 2007), but the German catchment areas have not as yet been appropriately involved in this process, e. g. as the city of Konstanz (which sees itself as belonging to the Zurich Metropolitan Region), feels not particularly well informed about the discussions being held in Switzerland.

8.4 Growth regions outside the metropolitan regions

Guiding principle 1 and the associated map show Baden-Württemberg as having two so-called growth areas outside the inner metropolitan catchment areas, i. e. the Lake Constance area and the region around Freiburg im Breisgau. Aring, Reuther (2006: 3) also identified both of these areas, as well as Ulm, as so-called "regiopoies" (Chapter 5.3.2.). All these areas,¹⁵⁸ most of which are rather rural and middle-class, have in common that they make a high overall contribution towards economic growth, but are at the same time not in the immediate vicinity of a metropolis (Einig et al 2006: 626). They also do not fit into the "known pattern of large growth regions" (Zimmermann 2007: 16). Unlike the very dense metropolitan regions, these regions combine incipient urbanisation with favourable structural data with regard to all aspects of sustainability, and do not suffer from problems of densification (e. g. traffic problems) or those of thinly populated rural regions (e. g. lack of infrastructure) (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2005: 5). This could also be one of the greatest opportunities for these growth regions; Scholich (2008: 6 f.) argues that in future locational competition it is open spaces and attractive landscapes that will be decisive rather than commercial estates and infrastructure, which "tend to be ubiquitously available".

In Baden-Württemberg all of the growth regions outside the metropolitan regions are border regions. In the Framework for Spatial Policy Activities, the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning advocated the further development of cross-border co-operation. Agreements between countries and spatial coordination of spatially significant individual projects are called for. The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (2006: 711) thus regards it as essential to give targeted support to these areas that "could be of international significance" as "innovation centres and locations of specialised technology" and recommends a regional development concept in this regard. The legal conditions for such a concept would have to be created, as the various legal and administrative practices have thus far not made provision for binding cross-border programmes and plans. There are also demands for financial support from the EU to make the implementation of concrete projects possible (MKRO 1995: 32).

¹⁵⁸ In Germany, this includes the Bavarian districts of Dingolfing-Landau and Altötting, as well as Emsland in Lower Saxony.

8.4.1 The Lake Constance region

Due to its position in the extreme south of both Baden-Württemberg and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Lake Constance region is at a comparatively great distance from the nearest metropolitan region and the seat of government. It thus, along with Vorarlberg and the north-eastern cantons of Switzerland, forms part of the "peripheral club" (Köhler 2007a: 106), even if the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (2008: 26) seems to recognise a "central position within the EU" after the establishment of the EU internal market.

The region has a polycentric structure, with one regional centre made up of three cities (Friedrichshafen, Ravensburg and Weingarten), as well as numerous medium-sized and small towns. It is particularly well positioned with regard to technological capacity and density of patents, and is characterised by low unemployment and a high level of satisfaction among the population about living conditions.¹⁵⁹ Since 1997 the population has been seen to grow by 15 %, while between 1980 and 2005 the working population increased by 20.6 % in comparison with an increase of 8.1 % in Baden-Württemberg as a whole (BMVBS 2008: 19). In the period between 2000 and 2005, the region's position in the listed rankings generally improved (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2005: 84). In 2000 the region was awarded a prize at the "Regions of the Future" competition held at the Urban 21 world conference. The Federation of German Industries (BDI 2006: 84) also classifies the region as one of the most innovative in Germany, with the highest concentration of engineering companies, a patent quota that is twice as high as the German average and a generally medium-sized high-tech industrial landscape. In 2004 Prognos classified the Lake Constance district as one of the "hidden champions" and as a "highly specialised province", i.e. as a place that has managed to "build upon and modernise its historically grown technological specialisation" (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2005: 50). The current Prognos study sees the Lake Constance district as having very good future opportunities, while the Konstanz and Ravensburg districts have good future opportunities and the Sigmaringen district has a balance of opportunities and risks (Prognos 2007).

The border position on the one hand and the shared history and natural surroundings on the other hand led to intensive cooperation with adjoining regions in Switzerland and Austria at an early stage. In 1994, the International Lake Constance Conference (IBK) was established and the Lake Constance guiding principle compiled. The Lake Constance Euregio is graded as a "European model region" as a result of its experience and success in the field of cross-border cooperation.¹⁶⁰ The basis for a long-term, cross-border spatial concept was laid in the INTERREG project named "D-A-C-H-Raum" (Lehmann et al 2007: 2). Governance structures have already been formed by cooperation between the IBK and an actually emerging association of cities located around Lake Constance. There is no plan for a formal administration level, but a business centre that could also represent the interests of the region, for example in its dealings with the European Union, may be established (Köhler 2007c). The current guiding principle for Lake Constance (IBK 2008: 5) supports the region's attempts to position itself as a

¹⁵⁹ Rank 11 among 97 German regions in the Technology Atlas 2002 by Prognos AG; Rank 4 among 97 regions for patent density according to the Patent Atlas 2002; the lowest unemployment rate in the Friedrichshafen/Ravensburg/Weingarten agglomeration area in Baden-Württemberg and Rank 8 among 117 regions with regard to the satisfaction of the population with the living conditions (cited in Köhler 2007a: 108).

¹⁶⁰ Quotation from the state ministry for Baden-Württemberg (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2006): "Corner stones of a new concept for cross-border cooperation by the state of Baden-Württemberg", as cited in Grasselli, Wütz (2007: 2).

cross-border, networked region with the aim of being internationally perceived as a dynamic economic location with significant growth potential.

One major problem is posed by the inadequate transport network, both internally and in terms of connections to other regions; another is the difficulties experienced in recruiting highly qualified employees. Pressure on land and facilities caused by the many and at times conflicting demands is also an increasing problem in the ecologically valuable region (see Megerle, Eberle 2005 in this context). Despite its growth dynamics and economic strength, the Lake Constance region is regarded as a holiday location rather than a business one (Köhler 2007a: 108). The regional association is therefore developing a working programme intended to "position the region for future competition between the metropolises and regions" (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2007:2) and for building up the Lake Constance business location as a brand (Köhler 2007c). Accreditation as a metropolitan region is not sought, as the "silent star"¹⁶¹ would then be in a weaker position in relation to the larger metropolitan regions (Köhler 2007c). Despite its economic success the city of Friedrichshafen sees the region as being "clearly below the defined size of European metropolitan regions", although this would not apply to a transnational metropolitan region. Such a region would, however, lack an "urban beacon". Despite its membership of the IBK, Zurich does not feel that it belongs to the Lake Constance area; it rather tends to view the Lake Constance area as an extension to its own metropolitan region (Map 2 and Chapter 8.3).

An allocation to the "areas of responsibility of the Metropolitan Regions of Stuttgart and Munich, or possibly to the area of responsibility of an emerging Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region", as well as the potential division of the Lake Constance region suggested by the guiding principles of the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning, have been rejected by both the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia regional association and the Upper Rhine/Lake Constance regional association. The suggestions are seen as being "diametrically opposed to the politically desirable process of areas around the lake growing together, a process that has been consistently pursued for many decades". They are also regarded as being in conflict with the state development plan, in which the Lake Constance region is explicitly regarded as an "independent, large-scale part of the country" (Grasselli, Wütz 2007: 1 f.). The minister of economic affairs for Baden-Württemberg, however, pointed out that the functional relations between the metropolitan cores and their catchment areas mark "historically developed, large-scale economic areas". This "allocation" thus does not refer to any "planning commitments, and certainly to none accompanied by any binding distribution of roles", but rather to functional interconnections between sub-regions, whereby it is left to the various institutions to decide the extent to which they wish to cooperate. Pfister thus sees an "opportunity for the Lake Constance region to make use of its special unity and strength within a larger spatial context" (Pfister 2007: 3).

An application has been made to the state parliament of Baden-Württemberg (Lehmann et al 2007) to recognise a "Lake Constance European Catchment Area", at state, federal and EU level, and to include the region as an "international growth area and thus as a European catchment area in the 'Growth and Innovation' guiding principle". Comparable strategies are being followed by the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia regional association (2007: 1). Lehmann et al (2007: 2) regards such an accreditation as a "clear strengthening" of the region "with regard to further multinational cooperation". In cooperation with the Upper Rhine/Lake Constance regional association, representatives

¹⁶¹ Classification in the Future Atlas 2004 published by Prognos AG.

of the Upper Rhine region and other cross-border regions, the establishment of a "European catchment area initiative" is being worked on. As a member of the research council for spatial planning of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs, the chairman of the association was involved in breaking down and differentiating elements of Guiding Principle 1 (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2007: 3). In the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia region, these efforts are positively viewed, as there are fears of being "decoupled as a fringe region".¹⁶² These fears are also related to changes in the subsidy system. INTERREG funding, which is very important for this region, could only be obtained "with the greatest of effort" for the Alpine Rhine/Lake Constance/Upper Rhine region for the 2007–2013 subsidy period. As of 2013, the only border regions to be subsidised may well be those at the outer EU borders (Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2006: 5). The city of Friedrichshafen sees important advantages in being classified as a metropolitan region, for instance with regard to transregional locational advertising and the increased incorporation of the economic area into national and European transport policies.¹⁶³ Even accreditation as a European catchment area could lead to support for the improvement of the apparently inadequate transport infrastructure.

A Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning was approved in 2008, in which the following fields of action are to be considered (according to the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia regional association: Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben 2007a): optimisation of the regional governance structures in the field of spatial development, strategic discussion of a functional-spatial division of labour between the various subregions, and the positioning of the Lake Constance region as a knowledge and innovation region. The demonstration project is highly innovative in terms of the support it receives from all political levels and many private actors, and in terms of the opportunity it offers of carrying out a strategic discussion about future spatial structures within a broadly designed process.

8.4.2 Other growth regions outside accredited metropolitan regions

Freiburg im Breisgau is named as a growth region in Guiding Principle 1 and is categorised as a regiopolis by Aring, Reutter (2006). More detailed information is given in Chapter 8.1, as Freiburg lies within the Upper Rhine region.

Together with the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia region, the Ulm region is one of the most innovative in Germany (BDI 2006: 84) and is listed by Prognos (2007) as a region with very good future potential, which profits from the university's "knowledge as a raw material". Nevertheless, unlike the Lake Constance area and the Freiburg regiopolis, this cross-border agglomeration area is not described as a growth region in Guiding Principle 1, it is merely shown on one diagram as a smaller location in the intermediate agglomeration area with further metropolitan functions. The Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning (2006: 710) regards the Ulm region as being in a transitional zone along the borders of the other metropolitan catchment areas, with links to two metropolitan regions.

¹⁶² Thus Fuchsloch writes in the *Schwäbische Zeitung* dated 14/12/2006, under the heading "Lake Constance region threatened by adversity" that through the creation of a European catchment area the regional associations are "countering the metropolitan regions, and are fighting to ensure that the Lake Constance region will not be decoupled as a fringe region".

¹⁶³ "When an economic area is part of the grid of European centres, the large-scale, transnationally significant quality of connections must attract more political attention" (Friedrichshafen).

The Baden-Württemberg state development plan gives special significance to this region with regard to the economic development of the Baden-Württemberg/Bavarian border region, including its position as a centre for academia and its spill-over effects to the neighbouring region of Lake Constance/Upper Swabia and East Württemberg. The important "bridging function between the European Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and Munich" is thus to be strengthened, as is the nodal function within the trans-European transport network (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: B66). No attempt is currently being made to achieve metropolitan region status for the Ulm region, but there may be cooperation with the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (Schulze 2006).

The Donau/Iller regional association does not regard itself as part of a metropolitan region. Interconnections with the Stuttgart region are seen as being few and the outermost sphere of influence of the Munich Metropolitan Region just touches the Günzburg district. Samain (2007) sees the region's chances of positioning itself as a small but independent region to be significantly better than if it would aim to be an "appendix" to one of the larger metropolitan regions. Unlike other regional associations, the regional centre of Ulm and the Donau/Iller regional association have therefore not attempted to be integrated into a metropolitan region.

8.5 "Peripheral regions" in south-western Germany?

The Federal Spatial Planning Report (BBR 2005: 20) indicates peripheral areas as being particularly in the north-east (Odenwald, Hohenlohe and East Württemberg) and the south (Black Forest, Swabian Alb, Upper Swabia). The orientation framework shows a so-called "area far from agglomerations" extending from the Upper Rhine axis in the south-east through the southern part of Baden-Württemberg (Bundesministerium für Raumordnung, Bauwesen und Städtebau 2003: 5). Unlike most of the other federal states, no stabilisation areas are shown on the map for Baden-Württemberg in Guiding Principle 1. Even rural areas outside the metropolitan catchment areas do not fulfil the empirical delimitation criteria, i.e. an above-average unemployment rate in 2003, above-average migration of young people aged 18–29 out of the area between 1994 and 2003, and a below-average GDP growth rate for the same period (Einig et al 2006: 626). In Baden-Württemberg, there is also no region that has to cope with extreme locational disadvantages due to its geographical position or its settlement structure (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007: 71). Baden-Württemberg thus currently has no stagnation areas or regions with considerable economic problems.

The state development plan makes provision for promoting disadvantaged regions so that "they can improve their competitiveness using their own strength", especially by mobilising the development reserves of these areas (Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2002: 51 f.). This includes parts of the Neckar/Odenwald district, the East Alb and the Zollern Alb districts (MLR 2008). All these areas lie inside accredited metropolitan regions.

8.5.1 Spill-over effects or the risk of marginalisation?

The responsible minister for agriculture Hauk (2007a) sees clear differences between peripheral and disadvantaged regions in East Germany and the rural regions in Baden-Württemberg, some of which have higher growth rates than the metropolitan regions and which he classifies as "growth engines". The growth dynamics in rural Baden-Württemberg are, in his opinion, "unique" within the European Union. Hauk (2007: 1 f.)

therefore categorises the rural area as the "backbone of Baden-Württemberg".¹⁶⁴ As Baden-Württemberg has profited from its decentralised settlement and economic structure in the past, "metropolises and rural areas must be jointly developed and not pitched against each other".

Despite the currently good economic situation in the rural areas (Chapter II), there are considerable fears that a reorientation of spatial development and economic development subsidies could sideline the rural areas. These fears are partially based on actual changes, e.g. alterations in the ERDF subsidy framework (Chapter 5.4) and the judgement that the sustainability of the medium-sized centre of Horb is endangered (Einig et al 2006: 629). On the other hand, they are in part caused by unreliable information and exaggerations in the media. One example is an article entitled "Rural areas to be sidelined", which states that future EU subsidies will only be directed towards metropolitan regions, based on the motto "support is only for areas where forces are already concentrated";¹⁶⁵ such coverage hardly contributes towards a factual discussion. Even the minister responsible stated at a conference on "Metropolitan Regions versus Rural Regions" that the new guiding principles "offer plenty of explosive material" and that Guiding Principle 1 in particular should be regarded as critical for rural areas. He then went on to question whether Upper Swabia, the Black Forest and the north-eastern part of Baden-Württemberg may be among the "loser regions" (Hauk 2007a). Such comments make the efforts of many rural areas to be integrated into the metropolitan regions, in the expectation that this will give them access to subsidies (Baumgartner 2007), and the results of the surveys (Chapter 8.6) perfectly understandable (Chapter 8.6).

The integration of large-scale areas into the metropolitan regions of Baden-Württemberg has resulted in multiple layers of regional and subsidy territories. Thus an overlap with metropolitan regions can be found among almost all the LEADER¹⁶⁶ action groups during the new subsidy period, i.e. 2007–2013.¹⁶⁷ Employees of the Ministry for Rural Affairs of Baden-Württemberg were still unaware of this overlap of territories in May 2008.¹⁶⁸ This also applies to disadvantaged areas (MLR 2008). A particularly dramatic layering of the various subsidy and project territories may be found in the area covered by the Neckar/Alb regional association. This area belongs to the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart but also includes the South-West Alb LEADER area, the disadvantaged Zollernalb area, and a biosphere area (the Münsingen region), the Swabian Alb geopark and one of the PLENUM¹⁶⁹ areas.

The idea of developing counter-strategies for rural areas may be seen as an alternative to the integration of rural areas into metropolitan regions. This includes both the

¹⁶⁴ Hauk (2007: 1) actually states: "More than 50 % of the gross domestic product of Baden-Württemberg is generated in rural areas", as well as (2007: 2), "educational institutions and small and medium-sized businesses, which are often world market leaders in their segment, are mostly found in rural areas". The figures quoted by Hauk are, however, in conflict with the current economic report (Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg 2007: 48), which states that the three very dense agglomeration areas of Stuttgart, Rhine/Neckar and Central Upper Rhine account for at least 50 % of the state's total economic performance.

¹⁶⁵ Schindler, D. (2007): "Ländlichem Raum droht Abstellgleis"; article in the Schwarzwälder Boten dated 22 March 2007.

¹⁶⁶ LEADER: Liason entre actions de developement de l'economie rurale, i.e. Linked actions for the development of the rural economy.

¹⁶⁷ Press release 268/2007 http://www.mlr.baden-wuerttemberg.de/cgi/styleguide/content.pl?ARTIKEL_ID=57591 (viewed on 14/05/2008).

¹⁶⁸ Verbal statement made by Dr Ris and M. Baumgartner at the third university day on "Development in rural areas" held in Stuttgart on 29 May 2008.

¹⁶⁹ PLENUM: Projekt des Landes zur Erhaltung und Entwicklung von Natur und Umwelt, i.e. State project for the conservation and development of nature and the environment.

"alternative guiding principles" mentioned in Chapter 5.3.4 and a specific development concept for the rural areas of Baden-Württemberg. In addition, Kaufmann (2007: 4) recommends a network of rural areas, comparable to the networks of the metropolitan regions. Kaufmann (2007: 9) also demands the elimination of the "distorted competition tied into state planning legislation". He believes that the two associations, VRS and Rhine/Neckar, have clear advantages through their clearly regulated responsibilities and sponsorships (including those for public transport and for the execution of large-scale projects). The differing framework conditions governing the regional planning institutions have "considerable effects on regional development". Kaufmann (2007: 9) therefore terms the state planning legislation as a "serious locational disadvantage for rural regions", as it does not make it possible for regions to compete under the same conditions.¹⁷⁰

As shown in Chapter 8.6, the central places outside the recognised metropolitan regions also fear that the metropolitan region concept could lead to a weakening of rural areas, especially as a result of a change in emphasis in the subsidy programmes.¹⁷¹ The city of Freiburg has criticised the lack of a spatial planning model for the whole of the area of the state; such a model should clearly allocate functions to the "remaining areas". The polycentric structure of Baden-Württemberg was emphasised several times: growth dynamics are not only concentrated in the metropolitan core areas.

8.6 Assessments by the municipal and regional actors

A survey conducted among the mayors of the municipalities with central place functions outside the recognised metropolitan regions of Stuttgart and Rhine/Neckar showed that the majority (77%) did not feel that they belonged to any of the metropolitan regions. Of the remaining quarter, the Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region was mentioned in nine cases, sometimes with the additional remark that it is a potential metropolitan region. The majority of responding municipalities in the Upper Rhine area thus saw themselves as belonging to this potential metropolitan region, which gives some insight into publicity work and regional awareness (Chapter 8.1). Both regional associations (central and southern Upper Rhine) regard themselves as part of the trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region. Two settlements close to the border see themselves as belonging to the metropolitan regions of Zurich (Konstanz) and Basel (Bad Säckingen) in northern Switzerland. In one case, the Friedrichshafen/Ravensburg dual regional centre was named as a metropolitan region.

Despite the high number of municipalities that do not feel that they belong to a metropolitan region, just under half of the municipalities had positive expectations of the metropolitan region concept. Among expectations mentioned were a general strengthening of economic power, and an improvement of image and visibility, which would also have a positive effect on areas outside the accredited metropolitan regions.¹⁷² In addition, subsidy programmes linked to the metropolitan regions could be used for extending infrastructure throughout the entire state.¹⁷³ A correlation between the positive expectations, the location of the municipalities, and their feeling of belonging to a metropolitan region clearly shows, however, that mainly municipalities

¹⁷⁰ Kaufmann states: "Seven-league boots for the metropolitan regions and leg irons for the others – this definitely will not work" (2007: 9).

¹⁷¹ "In general, I should like to state that from the point of view of the smaller municipalities, there are fears of being short-changed in comparison with the metropolitan regions when state finance is distributed in the future" (Friedingen).

¹⁷² An example is the reference made to "strengthening the entire economic area of Baden-Württemberg". (Tengen).


¹⁷³ "Better connections to the regions outside the metropolitan regions (transport, infrastructure, etc.) (Blaustein).

from the Upper Rhine region or economically strong settlements in growth engine areas outside the inner metropolitan catchment areas (e.g. Konstanz, Friedrichshafen and Ulm), had very positive expectations of the concept.

The negative expectations focus on the feared disadvantages to the rural regions, especially as a result of a transfer of subsidies to the conurbations. More than 80% of the municipalities that fear being disadvantaged explicitly mentioned a possible worsening in the position of rural areas and an increase in spatial disparities.¹⁷⁴ As expected, the correlations showed a close link to spatial category and the size of municipality. This includes the Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg regional association, which fears a "distribution fight", with reductions in subsidies for the rural areas (Kaufmann 2007: 3). Several municipalities had no expectations, as they found the concept incomprehensible or were not familiar with it.¹⁷⁵

As shown in Figure 21, the mayors of the central places assume that the concept of metropolitan regions is suitable for stimulating economic growth and successfully counteracting the effects of globalisation. Those who are sceptical regard the basic concept as rather unsuitable¹⁷⁶ or as a strategy for "creating advantages" for the conurbations (Dornhan).

Figure 21: Assessment of the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept and the concept of the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict (author's diagram).



The municipalities are quite critical, regarding the suitability of the concept for an intensification of cooperation over several planning levels. The mayors of the central places particularly expect problems with involving the population. This opinion is closely related to the many times that "residents affected" was named as a category of actors that should be more involved in the implementation process. There was doubt about the suitability of the concept to sustainability, nature conservation and environmental protection, and demographic change.¹⁷⁷ A certain amount of uncertainty is shown by the comparatively high proportion of municipalities that did not respond to this question (Figure 21).

¹⁷⁴ The concept of metropolitan regions incorporates "a premature relinquishing of the countryside and thus poses an obstacle to variety and the potential of knowledge development. Central and peripheral differentiation is furthered by the idea of metropolitan regions" (Markdorf).

¹⁷⁵ "I have no information and therefore also no expectations" (Rheinmünster).


¹⁷⁶ "With well-developed rural regions there is no need to emphasise the metropolis. The economy shows us that structures that are too large are harmful" (Dornhan).

¹⁷⁷ Ubstadt-Weiher even sees this as increasing the problem, as it will result in a concentration in the metropolis.

The assessments of the regional associations are strongly correlated with their various locations. While the Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg regional association is mostly critical about the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept, Donau/Iller and Southern Upper Rhine clearly view the matter in a more positive light. This applies similarly to the Central Upper Rhine and Lake Constance/Upper Swabia regional associations.

The rather negative valuations may also be associated with the fact that as many as 49% of the municipalities claim not to know the metropolitan region concept¹⁷⁸ or state that they regard the concept as incomprehensible. Several municipalities differentiated between the theory, which they understood, and its practical implementation, which they regarded as less transparent.¹⁷⁹ Some 47% regarded the concept as easily comprehensible, while the remainder was divided among non-responding municipalities and non-committal responses. The correlation between comprehensibility of the concept and spatial categories and municipality sizes showed some interesting results (Figure 22). While the majority of municipalities within the agglomeration area and its fringes regarded the concept as transparent, those in the rural areas mostly either had problems understanding it or were unaware of the existence of such a concept.¹⁸⁰ A similar picture emerged with regard to the size of the municipality and central place classification. Among the larger settlements there was only one that had problems with the concept, but among the smaller municipalities it was the majority. There is a parallel situation with regional centres and small centres. Some of the smaller rural municipalities answered that they were not affected by the concept.

Figure 22: Comprehensibility and transparency of the concept and level of information (author's diagram)



As could be expected, assessment of the comprehensibility of the concept was correlated with the degree of information. As shown in Figure 22, at least half of the municipalities within the agglomeration area and its fringes felt that they were well

¹⁷⁸ Here is an example in the form of a response received from the mayor of a small town in the southern Black Forest: "There may be few of my colleagues who admit, like me, that we are gradually losing our overview of the increasing number of administrative structures and levels with private industry involvement – sometimes meeting public needs – and/or the potential subsidies from numerous sources. I can therefore not spontaneously find much to say about your "model region" and its effects ...".

¹⁷⁹ "At the moment this constitutes a theoretical spatial construct with numerous individual objectives. Whether reality takes these theoretical instructions as an orientation remains to be seen in the long term" (Markdorf).

¹⁸⁰ "The instruments that are to be used to strengthen the strengths are as yet not clear. Thus far only the political goals to be pursued with the aid of the "lighthouse projects" are clear. Even the effects on future subsidy policies are being kept quiet and so also the effects for EU subsidies for rural regions" (Bräunlingen).

informed,¹⁸¹ while especially smaller municipalities in rural areas complained about the considerable lack of information. The municipalities had expected information from the following sources: the Ministry for Economic Affairs of Baden-Württemberg and other political institutions, the state of Baden-Württemberg,¹⁸² the responsible regional association, as well as the European Union.

Lighthouse projects and the compilation of guiding principles were mentioned with almost equal frequency as possible strategies for the implementation of the concept in planning practice. Some 16% of municipalities regarded the parallel execution of both approaches as essential, while 37% favoured compiling guiding principles and 32% wanted implementation in the form of lighthouse projects. The following potential implementation strategies were also mentioned: an extension of modern information and communication technologies in all regions, equalisation between conurbations and rural areas by means of clearly defined development goals, an overall concept for Germany and the EU with special emphasis on rural areas, the creation of theme-related networks, and also the preservation of tried and trusted spatial development policies.

A third of the municipalities as well as the regional associations of Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg and Donau/Iller was of the opinion that the objectives of the metropolitan regional concept could also have been attained by using the spatial planning instruments previously available. Regional and state planning were frequently mentioned in this regard. However, mention was also often made in this context of the necessity of strengthening jurisdictions and optimising implementation.¹⁸³ Just under half of the municipalities were of the opinion, however, that a new concept was required, as spatial planning has thus far failed to take much notice of international aspects, including the Lisbon strategy.¹⁸⁴ It was also said that there is also too little information exchanged between regional planning and the economy. The city of Pfullendorf believes that aspects such as marketing or external representation were not covered by previous spatial planning concepts. The belief that the previous spatial planning had no adequate concept for strongly interconnected border regions was often mentioned.¹⁸⁵ As to be expected, such remarks were only made by municipalities in the Upper Rhine region and the Southern Upper Rhine regional association, as they know the corresponding problems from daily planning practice (Chapter 8.1). The lack of concepts for the "remaining areas" was also a theme, along with a demand for a clear definition of the function of non-metropolitan areas (Freiburg). This question, concerning spatial planning instruments, also revealed a high degree of uncertainty, as just under one fifth of the municipalities were unable to provide an answer.¹⁸⁶

Further uncertainty was revealed by the question whether the concept of metropolitan regions, as well as the new guiding principles and action strategies developed in 2006, demonstrated a paradigm shift in spatial planning. Almost one third of the munic-

¹⁸¹ It was surprising to note that the lord mayor of one regional centre claimed that he was unable to complete the questionnaire, as he had too little information about metropolitan regions. Another lord mayor of a regional centre felt sufficiently well informed, thanks to the relevant Wikipedia entry.

¹⁸² "If it were relevant for those of us in rural areas, I would have expected the state to organise an information event, the invitation to which would have explained the relevance for us" (Meßkirch).

¹⁸³ "If the regional plans are ideally coordinated and there is constructive interaction between the institutions involved (chambers of industry and commerce, technology centres, districts, cities, etc.) this should work" (Bad Schönborn).

¹⁸⁴ "The previously valid federal spatial planning concept is diametrically opposed to the Lisbon strategy" (Freiburg).


¹⁸⁵ "The Upper Rhine region is an example of the failure of German spatial planning to provide adequate concepts for strongly interconnected border regions" (Karlsruhe).

¹⁸⁶ "This question cannot be properly answered, as it requires detailed knowledge of the European structural subsidy policy" (Baden-Baden).

palties did not answer this question. The majority of the responding municipalities saw a clear paradigm shift. The reasons given were strongly related to the fear of subsidy changes that would disadvantage rural areas.¹⁸⁷ Thus a correlation with spatial categories also revealed a significantly higher share of municipalities in rural areas that saw signs of a paradigm shift. The ratio stands at almost three quarters (72 %) in favour and only just over one quarter (28 %) against the notion of a paradigm shift,¹⁸⁸ whereas within the agglomeration areas and their fringes, only half of all respondents saw a paradigm shift. This corresponds with the regional associations. Only Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg sees a clear paradigm shift in the change in subsidy policy from balancing out inequalities to strengthening strengths.

The large-scale communities of responsibility associated with the metropolitan region concept are evidently viewed very sceptically by the municipalities directly affected. Only one in five expects the metropolitan regions to have positive spill-over effects, while clearly more than half fear negative effects on the areas outside the metropolitan regions.¹⁸⁹ One quarter of the municipalities opted for a reticent response. Under the heading "Other" they stated either that these effects are difficult to judge at the moment or that both positive and negative effects are to be expected.¹⁹⁰ There were very close correlations between the expectation of negative effects and a location in the rural areas or a categorisation as a small or local centre (Figure 23). This in turn also applies to the regional associations, with only Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg expecting clearly negative effects. The Donau/Iller regional association believes there may be a change in the magnitude of effects, currently regarded as negligible, if metropolitan regions are subsidised by EU or national subsidy programmes. Rural municipalities frequently emphasised the special position of Baden-Württemberg in this regard, due to its poly-centric economic structure.¹⁹¹

Figure 23: Central places: assessment of a possible paradigm shift, and spill-over effects (author's diagram).



¹⁸⁷ Paradigm shift, as turning away from equal standards of living (Achern).

¹⁸⁸ The rural municipality of Dunningen supports its opinion that there is no paradigm shift by saying that Baden-Württemberg will continue to develop its rural areas.


¹⁸⁹ "If the rural regions are not included, this will result in extreme distortions, especially with a view to demographic developments in Germany" (Biberach). The town of Riedlingen predicts a very negative development overall: "A loss of culture and traditional values, especially in rural areas, caused by migration to conurbations, etc, the formation of ghettos in the centres and the depopulation of rural regions".

¹⁹⁰ "At the moment the effects are rather small, but this might change as soon as EU subsidies or federal funding is used to promote the metropolitan regions in a targeted way" (Ulm).

¹⁹¹ "Baden-Württemberg is only leading in many areas because its rural environment is also strong" (Dunningen).

Despite the general scepticism of the municipalities towards the communities of responsibility and the fears expressed by 70% of respondents that financial support of the metropolitan regions would result in less money being available to other regions, 60% of the municipalities regard the subsidising of growth engines as being in principle justified, but with growth engines also being identified in the rural areas. The arguments in favour of this are comparable to the general expectations of the metropolitan region concept, i.e. the promotion of the dynamic economic centres is associated with the idea of a motor function that takes others along with it.¹⁹² It is also deemed essential to increase locational attractiveness in an increasingly globalised economy.¹⁹³ Some of the proponents of this theory did state, though, that an evaluation of the predicted spill-over effects should be carried out¹⁹⁴; or that there should be no exclusive concentration on the growth engines, but that the other regions should also be "taken into account" (Bruchsal); or that the "strengthening the strengths" model should be supplemented by a spatial planning model of "functional and spatial division of labour" (Freiburg). A rejection of growth promotion was often supported by the argument that the existing strengths were sufficient, or by reference to the success of existing subsidy policy.¹⁹⁵ A correlation with spatial categories and central place categorisation shows that municipalities in agglomeration areas and municipalities functioning as regional and medium-sized centres are almost all proponents of subsidies for the growth engines, while this rate is clearly lower among the small centres and rural municipalities (Figure 24).

Figure 24: General support of growth engines and possible restriction of planning authority (author's diagram)



72% of the municipalities fear that funding will decrease in other areas in the event that the metropolitan regions are subsidised.¹⁹⁶ Even municipalities that are in principle in favour of growth promotion often expressed their misgivings that this might result in less subsidies for the rural areas.¹⁹⁷ This attitude was also expressed by the regional associations. Only in a few cases was it assumed that the growth dynamics would result in added value that could benefit everyone in the medium term.

¹⁹² "Because like that the entire 'region' grows" (Bad Schönborn); "meaningful from a general perspective" (Friedingen); "if growth is successfully promoted, there will be more to distribute" (Karlsruhe); "these regions must provide the money to support the poorer regions" (Meßkirch).

¹⁹³ "It might be necessary if we do not want to become disconnected from the global economy" (Freiburg).

¹⁹⁴ It would have to be proven, however, that this growth directly or indirectly benefits the other regions (Bad Dürrenheim).

¹⁹⁵ "BW has done well with its subsidy policy, which also takes the rural areas into account" (Bräunlingen).


¹⁹⁶ "The wrong approach will necessarily result in a flawed distribution of funds, rural areas will suffer from this" (Hüfingen).

¹⁹⁷ The municipality of Blaustein mentions the Stuttgart 21 project and public transport in rural areas.

The options mentioned for financing the metropolitan regions are mainly subsidy programmes offered by the European Union, but also by the state of Baden-Württemberg and the Federal Republic of Germany. Project-orientated financing by the various actors was also relatively frequently mentioned, but levy-based financing by the municipalities was rarely mentioned.

The municipalities outside the metropolitan regions are mostly in favour of large-scale delimitation, with only just under a third of them wanting a region limited to the agglomeration area.¹⁹⁸ It is surprising to note that four municipalities can imagine both variants, arguing on the one hand for the greater potential inherent in a larger area and on the other hand for the more transparent cooperation and better communication possible in the agglomeration area.¹⁹⁹ Another argument for the delimitation to be limited to the agglomeration area is that it makes no sense to have the "entire area composed only of metropolitan regions". The city of Bad Dürkheim insists, however, that the regions left out of such metropolitan regions need "showing clear development opportunities".

Figure 25: Endorsement of a clear territorial delimitation and the option of a network structure (author's diagram)



These responses correlate with the fact that a slight majority does not regard a clear territorial delimitation as necessary,²⁰⁰ while 37% do. This, in turn, largely correlates with 49% of the municipalities that consider a network structure with project- and theme-orientated cooperation to be more suitable than a clear territorial delimitation. The rejection of the network structure is supported by reference to difficulties with target-orientated project implementation and to the impossibility of developing regional awareness.

A comparison of the three responses received to the delimitation question reveals a very mixed picture. Some 37% of the respondents favoured large-scale regions with flexible geometries and network cooperation, followed by 18% who wanted large-scale delimitation, but wished to combine this with clear boundaries. Just under 11% were in favour of limiting the region to the agglomeration area and against any external network cooperation. Only 5% could imagine a model limited to the agglomeration area but

¹⁹⁸ The rural municipality of Haslach supports this argument by saying that "the rural area adjoining a metropolitan region can profit from it, but retains its advantages as a non-metropolis (clarity)".

¹⁹⁹ "This question cannot be clearly answered with a yes or no, as spatial planning theory, political practice and group interests diverge in these matters" (Baden-Baden).

²⁰⁰ A clear territorial delimitation would not meet the needs of a dynamic development process and would create stigmatised "loser regions" from the very beginning (KiBlegg).

open at the borders for flexible network cooperation²⁰¹. Some combinations suggest, however, that the problem of regional delimitation was not clearly understood, for instance, in one case a restriction to the agglomeration area could be envisaged with flexible geometries and in another a large-scale and open region could be envisaged but networks were rejected.

Like the larger settlements and the regional and medium-sized centres, municipalities within the agglomeration area and its fringes regard clear territorial delimitation as far more necessary than small rural municipalities. Similarly, network cooperation is more strongly favoured in the rural regions.

The regional planning level is seen as best suited for the implementation of the metropolitan region concept and its management, followed by a possible institution at state level. The establishment of a new and independent committee was another possibility that was frequently cited, for instance by the Southern Upper Rhine regional association. Only occasional mention was made of other institutions or the lord mayor of the core city as possibilities. The latter may be explained by the fact that Baden-Württemberg has only one, clearly dominant core city, i.e. Stuttgart. A decision for a core city would be impossible in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region and even more so in the trinational Upper Rhine region.

The wish to involve other actors was fairly balanced. While 16% had no opinion in this regard, 40% regarded the current spectrum of actors as adequate, and 44% regarded the involvement of the following groups as important for implementation: economic representatives (most frequently mentioned), followed by cities and municipalities, residents and associations. Research, regional associations, tourism, etc. were also mentioned.

The question of planning authority at municipal level yielded some relatively surprising results. 63% of the municipalities of central places could not imagine any restriction of municipal planning authority and an amazing 11% had no clear opinion. The percentage of respondents (26%) who would be prepared to give up municipal planning authority at least in some areas in favour of trans-municipal planning is surprisingly high. The reasons given for this included avoiding parochial thinking and increasing efficiency in the implementation of regional plans.²⁰² The reasons against a restriction of planning authority are more or less the same as those given by respondents from the Stuttgart and Rhine/Neckar metropolitan regions (Chapters 6 and 7), i.e. that restrictions already exist, for example those imposed by EU directives (e.g. Fauna-Flora-Habitat), but also that the municipal planning authority is legally anchored in the constitution. At this point, some very detailed reasons are given for the differences between planning at regional and at municipal level.²⁰³ Medium-sized municipalities and centres were among those who could most readily imagine a restriction of their

²⁰¹ The city of Bad Dürkheim does not regard integration of rural areas into the metropolitan regions as useful (see above), but does advocate networked cooperation with the remaining regions ("our region can only be usefully developed and strengthened by networking").

²⁰² "Transregional matters must be decided on at transregional level. Individual municipalities may not prevent such projects." (Bad Dürkheim) and "Provided that there is a coordinated overall concept for the metropolitan region and all the relevant actors, a restriction in municipal planning authority may be useful" (Bruchsal).

²⁰³ "Central tasks of the EMR (locational marketing at European level, lobbying with national governments) hardly show any overlap with municipal planning authority (management of building)" (Karlsruhe).

"The municipalities have already found out, as a result of non-democratically legitimate intervention by the EU, e.g. Natura 2000 and FFH, what it means to have to give up municipal planning authority without involvement. Planning rights are actually part of municipal rights in terms of the constitution. Where necessary, the municipalities work together on their own initiative and as a result of their own needs to form planning associations, special-purpose associations, etc., but they do this voluntarily. Unfortunately the BW success model is increasingly being wiped out in a Europe that is now more centrally governed than ever before" (Sulz am Neckar).

planning authority. Both small municipalities and most large cities were not prepared to envisage giving up any of their municipal planning authority (Figure 24). Surprisingly, the two regional centres of Freiburg and Lörrach were able to envisage a restriction of their planning authority,²⁰⁴ but this was not the case for any of the regional associations.

8.7 Summary and prognosis


The areas outside accredited metropolitan regions in south-western Germany represent a multi-faceted and heterogeneous group.

The Upper Rhine and Lake Constance regions are two dynamic growth regions outside the inner metropolitan catchment areas that have high potential, especially in innovative industries. Both are in border positions and through the integration of the Swiss areas transcend EU borders. The manifold challenges generally found in transnational cooperation regions are exacerbated in the Upper Rhine region by a persistent language barrier as well as by the highly complex, multipolar territorial system with its barely comprehensible interconnections and mixing of actors and responsibilities. The joint declaration of the establishment of a trinational metropolitan region makes provision for implementation without the creation of a new administrative unit, in close cooperation and on the basis of "complementarity, subsidiarity and an economy of resources", with the Eurodistricts and the TriRhena and Pamina (Trinational Congress 2008: 5). To date, however, there has been hardly any discussion about whether it is sensible to integrate smaller catchment areas into one larger region. The current "babushka principle" (Frey 2002: 131) is not only becoming increasingly less transparent for the municipal actors, but also constitutes a considerable obstacle to a uniform implementation strategy.

Because of its polycentric structure and its strong economy, there is little need to speak of peripheral disadvantaged regions in Baden-Württemberg. It is one of the few German states without any stabilisation areas (MKRO 2006a: 13). Nevertheless, the rural regions expressed considerable concerns, especially with regard to any change in subsidy structure. The large-scale communities of responsibility that are part of the metropolitan region concept are also regarded with some scepticism, with only one fifth of the smaller municipalities in rural areas expecting any positive spill-over effects. These statements significantly correlated with the low level of information. Marginalisation fears could be reduced by implementing an appropriate information policy and by formulating an overall strategy at state level that transparently shows development perspectives for all sub-regions.

²⁰⁴ "Without these self-restrictions imposed by all partners and at all levels, the metropolitan regions can hardly be successful; we will have to think about counter-principles and the reorganisation of town planning rights in the very near future" (Freiburg im Breisgau).

Map 6: Rural areas and metropolitan regions in south-western Germany



With 41 %, the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart has the lowest proportion of rural municipalities of all the metropolitan regions considered. For the Baden-Württemberg part of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region alone, the proportion amounts to more than half (51 %) and reaches 55 % in the Baden-Württemberg part of the Upper Rhine region. The latter value would probably be higher if the French regions were included as

much of the Alsace region is very rural. There are, however, no comparable spatial categories for France. As may be expected, the area outside the metropolitan regions is predominantly rural.


Table 6: Spatial categories within and outside the accredited metropolitan regions (author's compilation)

| Regional unit | Agglomeration area | Fringes of the agglomeration area | Agglomeration area in a rural region | Rural area | Proportion of rural area (%) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|
| EMRS according to SDP 2002 | 144 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 % |
| EMRS – large territory | 144 | 93 | 29 | 184 | 41 % |
| Rhine/Neckar MR (Ba-Wü part) | 31 | 10 | 0 | 42 | 51 % |
| Potential Upper Rhine MR (Ba-Wü part) | 31 | 73 | 11 | 142 | 55 % |
| Total MRs according to MKRO | 175 | 103 | 29 | 226 | 42 % |
| Total MRs, including Upper Rhine | 206 | 176 | 40 | 368 | 46.5 % |
| Ba-Wü outside MRs | 15 | 18 | 17 | 240 | 83 % |

The definitions of metropolitan regions discussed in Chapter 2.1 assume, for instance, "high-density urban conurbations" (BBR, BMVBS 2006: 58), political and economic centres of power, good international accessibility and a high density of R&D facilities (Blotevogel 2002: 346). It is thus somewhat surprising to note that the category "agglomeration area" accounts for a minimum of 12 % (Upper Rhine) to a maximum of 37 % (Rhine/Neckar) of the metropolitan regions under discussion. Even when the fringe areas are added to the agglomeration areas, only the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart is above the 50 % mark.

Closely related to this specific development of the territories of the metropolitan regions are the assessments of the municipal actors regarding appropriate delimitation or possible network cooperation.

Figure 26: Assessment of a clear territorial delimitation and acceptance of a network structure (author's diagram)




In Baden-Württemberg a slight majority (55 %) advocates a clear territorial delimitation based on existing administrative units. However, a correlation with areas inside and outside the accredited metropolitan regions reveals a more differentiated picture. While within the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region support for the clear territorial delimitation chosen amounts to 85 %, it drops to 52 % for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and reaches its lowest point in the central places outside the metropolitan regions (33 %). With a non-response rate of 14 % though, the central places also appeared to be most uncertain with regard to the question of delimitation. The differences between agglomeration areas and rural areas were also relatively clear. Municipalities in agglomeration areas are much more in favour of clear territorial delimitation. As seen from the additional comments made by the municipalities, the marginalisation fears of the rural areas were apparent in their evaluations. This is almost certainly partially due to recent subsidy practices whereby eligibility for funding depended directly on belonging to specific spatial categories or regional configurations (e.g. LEADER, PLENUM, Development of Rural Areas – ELR-). As so far integration into a metropolitan region has not been associated with any financial obligations, municipalities specifically mentioned that there might be advantages to being part of a metropolitan region and that it was better to be on the safe side and join in (e.g. Hardthausen am Kocher). In contrast, some VRS municipalities, where levy-based financing is obligatory, would have preferred not to be part of the metropolitan region, as they only expected further financial obligations (e.g. Aichelberg).

The statements made about network structures are less clear than those made about territorial delimitation. However, the formulation of the question as to whether network cooperation could also be imagined certainly played a significant role here. A certain tendency towards general agreement can therefore not be ruled out. There is though, nonetheless, a rejection rate of 39 %. Arguments were mainly based on the impossibility of combining network structures and concrete experience from planning practice. There were no clearly significant regional differences. What was apparent, though, was the high non-response rate among the central places (16 %). There were clear differences between the various spatial categories. Rural municipalities advocate a network structure significantly more frequently than municipalities in agglomeration areas. This also reflects the marginalisation fears of rural municipalities, which, especially in the case of a clear territorial delimitation without extended network cooperation, can be easily understood. These fears are in turn closely related to views about the large-scale communities of responsibility and the expected spill-over effects from the growth engines.

As shown in Figure 27, not even half the municipal actors expect any positive spill-over effects. A differentiation by spatial category and region shows very heterogeneous and surprising results. While 73 % of respondents in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region expect positive effects, this value is only 43 % for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and drops to a low of 17 % for the two regions Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg and Danube/Iller, both of which lie completely outside accredited metropolitan regions. Rural areas gave a clearly more negative assessment than agglomeration areas.

Despite the negative assessment of the spill-over effects of the growth engines, only just under a quarter of the municipalities (23%) rejects the idea of supporting them. However, the non-response rate is relatively high at 15%. A correlation with regions and spatial categories surprisingly results in the highest number of proponents being in the Upper Rhine region, followed by the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region. The lowest level of agreement and the highest rejection rates were found in the Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg region. The second highest rejection rate was in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart: 26%. This means that the rejection rate in Stuttgart is almost as high as that in the overall rural area of Baden-Württemberg, where it lies at 31%.

Figure 27: Assessment of the spill-over effects and endorsement of the general support of growth engines (author's diagram)




Some 64% of the municipalities fear that supporting the growth engines will result in scarcer financial resources elsewhere. These arguments are mainly based on the assumption that setting priorities for the distribution of limited financial funds means that there will logically be a shortage somewhere else. The 27% who do not fear such shortages mostly believed that the targeted support of growth engines will result in added value, from which all will benefit in the long run. The latter argument is frequently used by municipalities in the Rhine/Neckar region, while there is more scepticism in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart and in the areas outside the metropolitan regions, which can also be seen in the lack of responses from a higher number of municipalities in these areas.

Among the various financing models mentioned, funding from the European Union was by far the most popular. Of 226 municipalities, 179 ticked this option, i.e. 79% of all respondents. This high rate is probably related to discussions about the form of EU subsidies in the 2007–2013 period that were being held at the time of the survey. This high value is unsurprisingly given that many actors expected a stronger focus on growth engines within the framework of the Lisbon strategy, and indeed there was even speculation about a separate subsidy programme for metropolitan regions. Generally speaking, subsidy programmes at state or supranational level were often selected, whereas municipal levy-based financing could only be imagined by 43 of the 226 municipalities, i.e. by less than one fifth. Project-orientated financing, i.e. direct financial participation by those who also profit from the project in question, was regarded as adequate by more than half (56%) of the responding municipalities. The rejection of levy-based financing is not only related to the budgeting problems frequently experienced by the municipalities, but – as can be seen in the case of the VRS (Chapter 6.7) – is clearly related to the feeling of unfairness experienced by municipalities that have to pay for projects they regard as being of little benefit to them, while other

municipalities are not obliged to make such payments, as they are part of other political-administrative units. One of the consequences of this is the low value (10%) for levy-based financing recorded for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, which is clearly below the average for Baden-Württemberg as a whole.

Figure 28: Preferred implementation strategies and assessment of the suitability of previous spatial planning concepts (author's diagram)



When considering general strategies for the implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice, a distinction can be made between compiling overall guiding principles, the execution of lighthouse projects and a combination of both of these strategies. As shown in Figure 28, the responding municipalities favoured the compilation of guiding principles. Lighthouse projects and a combination of both strategies achieved almost the same results. A correlation with the areas inside and outside metropolitan regions showed a clear preference for a combination of both strategies in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region. The central places preferred the lighthouse projects, whereas Stuttgart was more in favour of the guiding principles.


Previous spatial planning concepts were regarded as inadequate for the current challenges posed by spatial development by almost half (46%) of the municipalities. On the other hand, 41% were of the opinion that the targets associated with the metropolitan region concept could also have been achieved with the previous concepts, sometimes subject to more consistent implementation.

An interesting aspect is the correlation with the regions. The "internal regions" of Black Forest/Baar/Heuberg and Danube/Iller, as well as the Lake Constance/Upper Swabia region were divided about the suitability of the previous spatial planning concepts and the need for new ones. The Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart had a clear majority that regarded the previous concepts as adequate. However, in the two "border regions" of Upper Rhine and Rhine/Neckar 70% and 74% of responding municipalities regarded new concepts as essential. The statement by the regional centre of Karlsruhe, that the Upper Rhine region clearly shows that federal spatial planning does not offer adequate concepts for strongly interconnected border regions, is shared by numerous "border region actors".

Closely related to the new spatial planning concepts is a possible restriction of the municipalities' planning authority in favour of planning at metropolitan level. The constitutionally rooted planning authority is generally a sensitive issue in the Federal Republic of Germany. This was also reflected in numerous responses received as part of the present investigation. It is apparent from Figure 29 that only one quarter of respondents was able to imagine a restriction of their planning authority. This question resulted

in a fairly heterogeneous picture when correlated with the regions. The highest rejection rate was recorded in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart. Less than one fifth of the municipalities (19%) there could image such restrictions. It is, however, possible to differentiate further within the metropolitan region: in the agglomeration areas of the VRS 25% of respondents could imagine such restrictions, whereas all respondents from the Northern Black Forest and East Württemberg regional associations regarded restrictions on municipal planning authority as out of the question. This has parallels with the overview of Baden-Württemberg as a whole divided by spatial category: rural municipalities rejected this possibility far more often than the municipalities in the agglomeration area. Surprisingly, when differentiated by region, the highest degree of agreement was recorded in the Black Forest (42%), a fairly rural area, even more than in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (38%).


Figure 29: General assessment of the restriction of municipal planning authority and the suitability of the metropolitan regional concept (author's diagram)



The assessment and evaluation of the metropolitan region concept is closely related to the comprehensibility and transparency of the concept for the municipal actors. There were just as many mayors who regarded the concept as being personally comprehensible and transparent as mayors who did not (47% in both cases). These figures must be viewed with some caution, however, as it is very probable that the percentage of municipalities for whom the concept is neither comprehensible nor transparent is somewhat higher. For instance, in the case of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart there were

fifteen and among the central places eight responses in which mayors explicitly stated that they could not complete the questionnaire due to a lack of relevant knowledge. As it can be assumed that the majority of mayors addressed who did not feel able to complete the questionnaire also did not respond at all, the total percentage is surely higher. This is further supported by responses received from mayors who referred to colleagues who also failed to understand the concept. As already discussed in the individual analyses in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 and as can be seen in Figure 30, the level of knowledge demonstrated by the mayors is highly correlated with the location of their municipality in a certain region or spatial category, and to a certain extent with the size of the municipality and the level of involvement of the mayor in inter-municipal committees. The level of knowledge in the agglomeration areas is thus clearly higher than in the rural areas. The municipalities in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region were best informed, followed by the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region. In both cases it is highly probable that this is closely connected to the intensive publicity work carried out in the Rhine/Neckar area, especially with the aim of achieving accreditation (Chapter 7.2.1) as well as with the relatively intensive discussions held in the Upper Rhine area. The lowest level of understanding was found in the Black Forest municipalities.

Figure 30: Comprehensibility and level of information in Baden-Württemberg (author's figure)



The degree of comprehensibility is very closely related to the perceived amount of information. This is particularly low overall, with only 33 % of the municipalities feeling well to adequately informed. As expected, a correlation with spatial categories showed a clearly lower level of information in rural areas. A correlation with the regions is equally informative. In this case Stuttgart, with a share of 82 % of municipalities complaining about little or no information, tops the list by far. Even if the earlier survey period must be taken into account in this case, this value is terribly high and certainly explains some of the implementation problems suffered by the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart (Chapter 6). By far the highest level of information was achieved by the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, with 64 % of municipalities feeling well to adequately informed, closely followed by the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region with 52 %.

The municipal actors in Baden-Württemberg regarded the concept of metropolitan regions as being well suited for stimulating economic growth, as well as for successfully coping with globalisation effects. The issue of accelerating European integration is seen somewhat more sceptically by municipalities in the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, while Rhine/Neckar and the central places mainly agreed that the metropolitan region concept was suitable for this. The intensification of cooperation at various planning

levels was overwhelmingly regarded as being something that the concept addressed. The contrary is true for coping with demographic change and largely so for increasing integration of the population in the planning process. Once again, however, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, where 30 % regarded the metropolitan region concept as suitable for increasing integration, stood out. Surprisingly, both suitability for sustainable development and the promotion of nature and environmental protection were rated significantly higher than the integration of the population. While there was a certain amount of scepticism with regard to nature and environmental protection, the majority of the responding municipalities regarded the concept as suitable for sustainable development.

The overall evaluation clearly shows the differences between the various sub-regions of Baden-Württemberg. The municipalities of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region not only gave a clearly more positive evaluation in all aspects, but also had the lowest non-response rate for individual questions overall. The latter was quite high among the central places outside the metropolitan regions and reached over 30 % for some aspects.

9.2 Summary and conclusions about current implementation in south-western Germany

The current implementation landscape in Baden-Württemberg is very revealing. In the highly dynamic cross-border Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region a bottom-up application process was initiated and strongly supported by representatives of industry and has resulted not only in the favourable positioning of the metropolitan region in a relatively short period of time, but has also managed to build up "metropolitan awareness" within its territory. The choice of a clear structure with clearly defined borders and objectives, as well as clearly regulated responsibilities, reveals the influence of representatives of management and business and has little to do with the network structures with variable borders envisaged in the original concept. Nonetheless, it has so far proved itself and is supported by municipal actors. These conclusions are drawn from the overwhelmingly positive evaluations, the comparatively rare criticism and the perceptible optimism, as well as from remarks made from internal and external perspectives. The next few years will show whether the region manages to develop its own profile at the interface between the Rhine/Main and Stuttgart metropolitan regions, as well as whether the "spatial functional congruence" really constitutes a long-term trump of regional development and actually develops into a model of cooperation. In addition, the high level of involvement of business representatives, in particular their financial contributions and their consequent influence, must be critically observed.

In contrast the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart is frequently regarded as a benchmark and as a prototype for the reorientation of regional cooperation, but is characterised by considerable governance problems internally. This is certainly at least partially due to the unclear jurisdictions and undefined territorial delimitation found in the state development plan. Both have resulted in intensive discussions about the integration or exclusion of large areas in recent years. Related to this is the painstaking construction of metropolitan networks and governance structures, which has still not been satisfactorily completed.

The south west profits from its historical polycentricism, resulting in highly dynamic growth clusters even in rural areas. Neither the Ulm/Neu Ulm agglomeration area nor the Lake Constance area currently have ambitions to position themselves as smaller and weaker metropolitan regions, but are rather strengthening their growth potential as "regiopoieses". However, the Upper Rhine is striving for accreditation as a trinational

metropolitan region. Even though the municipal and regional actors are mainly in favour of this project, it is improbable that a third metropolitan region will be established in Baden-Württemberg. Thus far there is no concept for cross-border metropolitan regions that could cope with the high degree of complexity of various planning cultures and systems.

In areas near the borders, the strategies and approaches of various national planning systems are already interwoven. This is particularly the case in the Strasbourg/Ortenau Eurodistrict, which is recognised as a French metropolitan region, as well as in the Basel metropolitan region. Due to the short time that has elapsed, very few reliable statements can be made about concrete success and/or obstacles to implementation. As this is a highly interesting research field, however, the cross-border catchment areas should receive increased attention in future.

Although in Baden-Württemberg even the rural areas are comparatively strong economically and have rather good future prospects, there appears to be increasing marginalisation fears among regional and municipality actors in these areas. The concern that they will no longer be considered for subsidy programmes and so be exposed to the risk of marginalisation, has given rise to two different coping strategies. On the one hand, the significant extension of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart is connected to these fears. On the other hand, representatives of the rural areas have developed counter-strategies. Unfortunately this has resulted not only in the state government working in different directions, but also in territorial layering and overlaps between conflicting regional development programmes.

To ensure the successful implementation of the metropolitan region concept in south-western Germany, consensus within the state government thus appears essential (Scheffold 2007). The optimisation of the information policy at all levels is also vital and has thus far (with the exception of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region) been completely insufficient. As long as only one third of municipal actors feel well or adequately informed and as long as even divisional heads in state ministries are not familiar with important facts, the goals defined in the metropolitan region concept cannot be achieved.

Chapter III discusses general conclusions drawn about implementation in planning practice.

III Perspectives of implementation in south-western Germany: opportunities, obstacles and future challenges

As already discussed in Chapter 9, multiple facets of various forms of implementation of the metropolitan region concept can be found in planning practice in south-western Germany. There are also many unresolved issues between planning practice and planning theory, some of which are due to the special situation in Baden-Württemberg. Others, however, arise from the difference between a "traditional" understanding of planning based on deeply rooted experiences and convictions, and the innovative approaches of an integrative and project-orientated understanding of planning in combination with complex spatial developments.

The research approach chosen for this project is based on comprehensive surveys conducted among municipal and regional actors, an approach that was largely successful. In retrospective, it may be said that dispatching the questionnaire to the mayors via the Baden-Württemberg district or city council would probably have resulted in higher response rates. A "traditional" postal approach might also have been more successful in the smaller, rural districts than sending the questionnaire as an e-mail attachment. Generally speaking, the multiple-choice format used in many instances is somewhat restrictive, something that could be avoided by asking open questions or to an even greater degree by conducting personal interviews. Such a procedure would, however, have resulted in a lower response rate and could not have been conducted within an acceptable time frame.

10.1 Spatial interconnections, spatial polarisation and peripheralisation

In south-western Germany, there is an increasing discrepancy between functional and administrative territories. The current spatial realities of polycentric regions with complex economic networks have increasingly little in common with the old territories and political-administrative structures. This is particularly apparent in the case of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, where spatial-economic interconnections are especially intensive in the central Neckar core region but also extend well beyond this area. Thus there are close interconnections not only with the nearby regional centres of Tübingen, Reutlingen and Heilbronn, but with all economic areas in Baden-Württemberg, including the Lake Constance area, Ulm and Karlsruhe. "Territorial consolidation" to harmonise the functional and administrative territories would not only be politically difficult at the moment but would also make little sense from a spatial planning perspective. The multiple interconnections include not only economic but also cultural and historical aspects (the "old affiliations" to Baden or Württemberg remain influential until today) and are influenced by the natural surroundings etc., making clear territorial delimitation impossible. Even delimitation on the basis of the current spatial categories is problematic, as seen in the Pforzheim area. Here the Württemberg agglomeration areas around Stuttgart directly adjoin those of Baden. Even the state development plan fails to be precise here, as it stipulates the delimitation of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart as the agglomeration area and its fringes (Paragraph 6.2.2), allocates the Pforzheim area to the Upper Rhine region (Paragraph 6.2.3.2) and only refers to a bridging function, without specifically going into the problem of the adjoining agglomeration areas.

In Baden-Württemberg, the fact that many flows and interconnections cross existing borders exacerbates the problem. Heidelberg/Mannheim and Ulm are only sub-regions of a catchment area that extends across the borders of the federal states. Solutions can only be found through close cooperation between all the states involved. Even greater

challenges are faced by the transnational catchment areas of Lake Constance and the Upper Rhine, which have to cope with different planning systems, planning cultures and languages. As in these cases "territorial consolidation" with the creation of common political and administrative structures is not a realistic option, governance structures must be developed that will largely guarantee the implementation of the concept of metropolitan regions.

Another unresolved question is the positioning of areas that lie at the intersection of various regions and the development of a feeling of belonging (regional awareness) for their residents. This is a current problem in the case of the northern part of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region (which overlaps with the Rhine/Main Metropolitan Region) as well as in all border regions. The layering of the various territories and actor regions is most pronounced in the tri-national corner of the state. The "babushka principle" (Frey 2002: 131) that is found here means, for instance, that the city of Lörrach belongs to the potential trinational Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region, the Basel Metropolitan Region, the Basel Eurodistrict and the TriRhena region. In addition, in political-administrative terms Lörrach belongs to the Hochrhein/Lake Constance regional association, the Freiburg region and the Lörrach district, while there are also institutional links to the Basel Trinational Agglomeration, the trinational neighbourhood conference, the metrobasel, the municipally influenced TriRhena Council, and the Upper Rhine conference. In the meantime, the spatial and institutional degree of complexity is so high that it is barely comprehensible.

The issue of regional awareness and the formation of regional identity are similarly problematic for districts that form part of a growth-orientated metropolitan region, but also fall into a LEADER area and receive as disadvantaged regions (former Target 2 areas) financial assistance for sustainable development. Examples of such regions are to be found in the Neckar/Odenwald district, in Hohenlohe and in the Zollernalb region.

It remains to be seen whether a strategy such as that followed by the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, where strict delimitation according to previously existing administrative units was chosen and complex delimitation discussion thus avoided, is feasible in the long term or whether the discussions have only been postponed. Fixed borders could become critical when advantages and disadvantages are not evenly spread and concerns about unfairness or spill-over effects thus arise.

Although most of the actors surveyed prefer clear territorial delimitation, any form of delimitation should be regarded as a temporary solution, because regional and actor territories are constantly changing. Many planning practitioners, however, did not regard network cooperation as a feasible option for everyday use.

10.2 Metropolitan governance and network structures

It is clear from the discussion thus far that congruence between the institutional metropolitan level and spatial delimitations is both politically and theoretically very difficult to achieve.²⁰⁵ This makes the construction of large-scale governance and network structures within the framework of the planned communities of responsibility extremely significant. However, the empirical results showed a clear gap between planning theory and planning practice. This can be traced back to a myriad of factors.

One important factor that considerably impedes the establishment of appropriate governance structures is the long-standing, deeply rooted thinking of the mostly territorially

²⁰⁵ The Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region constitutes a singular case in this respect.

fixated actors in rigid spatial units and affiliations. The prospect of any division of the political-administrative units into sub-regions, some of which would then be integrated into certain network structures and some into other networks thus appears to be unthinkable for most planning practitioners. This may well be linked to the fact that previous subsidy programmes were always territorially bound.²⁰⁶ As integration into a metropolitan region has thus far not involved any further costs, for instance levy-based financing, attempts by the fringe areas to be integrated "for safety's sake" are perfectly understandable. This does, however, lead to excessively "bloated" metropolitan regions and therefore to conflicts. Territorial governance systems, which must be "inclusively" organised, i.e. which must involve all actor groups for reasons of legitimation and acceptance, are only feasible within small-scale structures (see Fürst 2008: 225). Large-scale territorial units such as the Stuttgart and Upper Rhine metropolitan regions thus suffer internally from an inability to act.

Another important factor is financing. Unlike administrative units, financing is clearly more complex in the case of network structures. Even for project financing it is not always straightforward to determine the participation ratios, particularly when it comes to the financing of the management of the network, i.e. for establishing a business centre to coordinate and steer the various activities. The empirical results obtained for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart showed considerable discrepancies in this regard. The financial basis of the Stuttgart regional association is territorially fixed, and there is little willingness among the adjoining spatial units to participate financially.

This is certainly also based on a third factor, the (at least partial) lack of trust and clarification of responsibilities and powers. Even when equal partners cooperate on a voluntary basis, the empirical research showed that it is essential to regulate the responsibilities and powers. The decisions of any not democratically legitimised committee are unlikely to be seen as binding by various groups of actors. When that committee is also cumbersome as result of the number and functions of the persons involved it seems to be ineffectual both in terms of rapid immediate decision-taking and also in terms of restrictive decisions that may involve disadvantages for individual actors. The management level particularly needs decision-making powers for lighthouse projects associated with advantages for individual actors and disadvantages for others. This also shows how tensions arise between territorial governance systems with inclusive networking and functional systems with selective networking. The former tend towards formal and institutionalised arrangements, while the latter focus on voluntary, project-related cooperation (Fürst 2008: 225 f.). Such mismatches are particularly evident in the case of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart.

A fourth factor that considerably hinders constructive work in planning practice are the long drawn-out discussions about the "correct form" of delimitation, jurisdictions, etc. This kind of "trench warfare", in which many personal interests are involved, was very negatively commented on by the municipalities and in Stuttgart it has prevented the establishment of a basic optimism, such as was found in the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region.

Another factor is to be found in the combination of governance structures and large-scale communities of responsibility. Blatter (2008: 32 f.) regards this purely spatially based conceptualisation of large-scale geographical units that have few interests in common as likely to reduce the probability of increasing the institutionalisation of metropolitan governance, something that he regards as essential. Blatter goes on to argue

²⁰⁶ This may, for example, apply to LEADER, ELR, biosphere regions, PLENUM, etc.

that particularly in the case of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart the metropolitan region concept adds little of value. The aspired creating of clusters within the scope of the Demonstration Project of Spatial Planning already took place previously through the use of spatially flexible networks. He sees the VRS as conducting a defensive fight that prevents the further development of the "very successful governance landscape" in the Stuttgart agglomeration area, and thus concludes, that "the concept of the European metropolitan region has few positive results in this case and tends to hamper rather than promote its own path of development" (Blatter 2008: 33).

Generally it must be stated that in large-scale regions the interaction costs are higher, the establishment of governance – especially institutionalised governance – structures is more difficult, and that allocation conflicts increase. Indeed, the question as to how relevant regional size actually is (Fürst 2008: 226), represents a decisive research issue. Similarly important is determining suitable mechanisms for new regional cooperation within the large-scale communities of responsibility, because established participation processes will "reach their limits" due to the "new character of the regions" (Grabski-Kieron 2007:41).

Unlike Stuttgart, the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region avoided this entire discussion by establishing a clear territorial delimitation and clear structures. This did, however, prevent discussion about the possibility of integrating of further areas (e. g. Karlsruhe) on the basis of existing flows and interconnections and about whether it actually made sense to include large-scale rural regions (e. g. Odenwald). Whether it will be possible to avoid a process-orientated clarification of such controversial issues or whether this has merely been postponed, remains to be seen. In the same way, only time will tell whether it is possible to maintain the spatial-functional congruence that is currently regarded as the "trump card of regional development" by the Spatial Planning Association (Raumordnungsverband 2005, 4).

10.3 Over-extension trends and marginalisation fears

The territory of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart – unlike that of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region but like that of many other German metropolitan regions – has become considerably over-inflated. This increase in size is not only due to the tying of subsidy programmes to territories that was common practice in the past, nor can it be explained by the wish to integrate political-administrative units in their entirety. It is mainly due rather to fears of marginalisation on the part of the "fringe regions". These fears are caused or exacerbated by various factors.

As the empirical research clearly shows, there are considerable doubts about the so-called large-scale communities of responsibility. As only a minority expect any positive spill-over effects and as there is thus far no agreement on mechanisms and rules for redistribution between the metropolitan cores and the outer areas, the fears of rural areas with regard to economic marginalisation are perfectly understandable. In addition, information provided has thus far been insufficient, which is a major cause of the lack of transparency of the metropolitan region concept and its associated goals. The low level of information has in turn lent more credibility to false statements, which have hinted at disadvantages for non-integrated regions.

The integration into a metropolitan region currently holds no disadvantages for the individual municipalities, but is connected to – sometimes considerable – advantages. This results in large spatial units. Even without the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region, there is in the south-west an ensemble of metropolitan regions (Stuttgart, Rhine/Neckar, Rhine/Main and Nürnberg) all of which directly adjoin one another. Quite apart

from the governance problems created by such entities and the problems of identifying with such territories, they also do not correspond with the definitions laid down in Chapter 2.1 or with the goals of the concept. Any credible external or internal marketing appears to be increasingly difficult or even impossible for these large regions.

In this regard there is a need for research into the concrete form that the large-scale communities of responsibility should take in south-western Germany. The polycentric structure of Baden-Württemberg must be particularly taken into account, with dynamic growth clusters not being restricted to the agglomeration areas. Implementation strategies must therefore be differently defined from those for regions where there is a single core centre with economically weaker surroundings. In the case of south-western Germany the extension of the metropolitan region concept to include regiopoles and European catchment areas thus seems indispensable. In the same way, increased efforts should be made to implement large-scale communities of responsibility with an institutionalised metropolitan core and partnership-based network cooperation with adjoining regions, rather than by "officially integrating" more disadvantaged rural areas into accredited metropolitan regions. The over-inflated Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart took this latter form and was regarded as lacking credibility, even by "internal actors".

10.4 Lack of an overall strategy for Baden-Württemberg

The empirical research clearly shows that the municipal and regional actors have thus far not benefited from any overall state strategy with development perspectives for all parts of the state. The 2002 State Development Plan only partially meets these requirements, especially as the goals and principles it contains with regard to both metropolitan regions and rural areas do not appear to be sufficiently concrete and leave relatively large scope for interpretation. This not only makes developments such as the multi-layering of the territories of the metropolitan regions and the LEADER subsidy areas possible, but also means that they have no real consequences.

Thus on the one hand it may be said that in some points developments in planning practice do not conform to the goals of the state development plan. This is particularly striking in the case of the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region which – in contrast to the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region – was not part of the state plan. The same may be said for the large territory of the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart: the state development plan allocates the Pforzheim area to the Upper Rhine region and does not include the rural areas in the metropolitan region. Despite these contrary developments, not only did the state government not explicitly respond, but the facts were actually accepted as they stood.

On the other hand it is still unclear how the development prospects for the rural regions and the "intermediate regions" are seen. Similar to the federal level, the various ministries in Baden-Württemberg have developed specific strategies for "their areas", without any visible coordination that suggests the existence of an overall strategy for all sub-regions. Currently there is also a lack of information exchange between the ministries, which also contributes to the overlap of at times conflicting subsidy systems.

"Top down" management on the basis of hard state-planning legal norms (see Blotevogel 1998: 17 f.) is hardly able to create a successful mobilisation and bundling of regional activities. However, a formal anchoring in state planning combined with a functional division of roles and clear perspectives for all areas would certainly help prevent marginalisation fears and their consequences. In addition, some changes to the terminology are advisable. Instead of referring to "peripheral or residual regions" – terms which are rightly regarded as derogatory by those concerned – the important functions,

opportunities and perspectives of all regions should be indicated. Although the metropolitan regions are becoming increasingly important as development engines, this should not lead planning practitioners to believe that there has been a complete change of direction in spatial development policy, at the expense of the non-metropolitan areas.

A comprehensive state strategy that takes into account the goals of the metropolitan region concept and the expectations of the rural regions could therefore not only reduce fears of marginalisation, but might also change the currently prevalent mentality of those who, to "be on the safe side", try to be part of as many subsidy programmes as possible. At the same time, there would have to be standardised conditions to such an overall strategy, perhaps through a change in the state planning laws, so that at least in this respect all regions of the state would have the same opportunities.

10.5 Specific concepts for transnational catchment areas

The overall strategy for the state would have to include aspects particular to cross-border catchment areas. Thus far it has not been clear how a trinational metropolitan region is to be implemented and how the three existing Eurodistricts should be involved in these endeavours. The same applies to the Lake Constance area, which has been assigned an independent role, as well as having several of its sub-regions allocated to different metropolitan regions. As was often mentioned by actors from the border regions, there are also no specific concepts for cross-border cooperation. Furthermore, there is a significant need for further research about the compatibility of various national planning systems and cultures in a single concept for cross-border metropolitan regions.

This leads to research questions about the way in which different national strategies compare. As a result of its border position and the cross-border catchment areas, Baden-Württemberg offers excellent opportunities to observe Swiss, Austrian and French strategies in relation to German ones, and to analyse their various strengths and weaknesses. This can then lead to an exchange of experience and to an increased transfer of know-how with regard to examples of best practice and benchmarking.

10.6 Perspectives of implementation – conclusions drawn on the basis of the research questions

If the research questions and gaps discussed in Chapter 2.3 are correlated with the empirical data collected in south-western Germany, interesting perspectives on implementation emerge and avenues for further research appear.

Spatiotemporal changes during the process of implementation were mainly recorded for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart, where twelve years have passed since the region was accredited by the Conference of Ministers for Spatial Planning and the issues of territorial delimitation and governance structures have emerged as problem areas and obstacles. Due to the fairly rigid implementation strategy chosen for the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, no comparable obstacles were observed in this region. It remains to be seen whether this approach proves itself over time or whether the discussions that have been held in Stuttgart will simply take place at a later stage. At the moment, progress in the implementation process for the potential Upper Rhine Metropolitan Region is another open question, as both state and federal spatial development policy is rather hesitant to accredit a third metropolitan region in Baden-Württemberg, despite the increasing efforts made by regional actors. This situation is further complicated by the transnational aspects of the region, which continue to constitute a significant obstacle to any uniform and overarching implementation strategy. It can thus be seen that the dy-

namics of the implementation process vary through Baden-Württemberg, primarily as a result of the different implementation strategies and actor configurations.

As far as expectations of the metropolitan region concept are concerned, the empirical research showed fairly clearly that especially smaller municipalities and actors in rural areas had considerable concerns that an increasing focus on the agglomeration areas might result in a decoupling of other areas. These fears clearly contradict, at least currently, the real economic data (Chapter II) in the polycentric and economically strong state of Baden-Württemberg. These negative expectations can therefore be traced primarily to an inadequate information policy and to the lack of an overall strategy for all sub-regions of the state. The empirical findings also clearly showed that the envisaged concept of large-scale communities of responsibility lacks transparency and credibility, particularly for actors from predominantly rural regions. Within this context, the federal level is also called upon to develop concepts and strategies for the concrete form of the communities of responsibility, for instance via the ongoing Demonstration Projects of Spatial Planning, and then to ensure that the public are sufficiently informed. It is particularly important to counter the negative expectations, as these fears are one of the main reasons for the over-inflation of the metropolitan region territories.

Currently there is no clear spatial polarisation between metropolitan regions and peripheral areas in Baden-Württemberg. However, the corresponding fears were found, especially among representatives of the rural areas (see above). To dispel these fears and to prevent the development of economic and social spatial polarisation, the state government must formulate an overall strategy that includes both implementation strategies for the metropolitan regions and development perspectives for areas outside the metropolitan regions.

The surveys conducted among the municipal and regional actors clearly show that there is still a considerable gap between planning theory and planning practice. This mainly applies to innovative planning approaches such as variable geometries or metropolitan governance structures; these are regarded as unrealistic and unworkable by many planning practitioners. The territorial fixation of political-administrative authorities and jurisdictions, and the differences between what the planning authorities and business representatives expect and need from a management system constitute significant obstacles to successful implementation. Apart from the fact that innovative approaches seem to require a certain "trial period", new rules and regulations are required, for example with regard to trade tax or equalisation payments for spatial units that take on tasks for others (including large-scale communities of responsibility).

The empirical research shows a significant information deficit in large parts of south-western Germany, especially among the municipal actors. The only exception is the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region, which integrated comprehensive publicity work into its specific implementation process. As long as even the lord mayors of large centres are not familiar with the metropolitan region concept and many mayors of smaller municipalities do not know even the basic terminology, then implementation deficits in planning practice, marginalisation fears and a lack of involvement are not surprising. The relevant institutions at all levels need to offer a comprehensive and thorough information policy. This could be ensured via appropriate publications or events, e. g. via the municipal and city council conference in Baden-Württemberg, which reaches all the mayors at comparatively low cost.

The specific challenges of transnational implementation strategies are very complex, especially in the case of south-western Germany, where cross-border cooperation involves the non-EU member Switzerland and, in the Alsace region, language barriers.

Apart from working out specific strategies, more intensive contact at all levels appears to be of special importance.

Finally it should be noted that the current implementation landscape in south-western Germany is not only multi-faceted and integrates a large variety of approaches, but that it also offers high potential for the successful implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice, provided that the above-mentioned problem areas and obstacles are adequately taken into account.

From the point of view of planning theory, further observation and analysis of the implementation process in south-western Germany promises valuable new findings that will contribute both to the development of innovative planning approaches and to resolving the issues of cross-border catchment areas. It would therefore be of great interest to conduct a panel discussion at several year intervals in order to document the further development of the implementation process.

Bibliography

- Abteilung Raumordnung, Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (2005): Internes Schreiben vom 08.02.2005 zur Weiterentwicklung des Konzeptes europäischer Metropolregionen in Deutschland, AR 20–3411.2/4–1.
- Adam, B. (2006): Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland – Perspektiven für das nächste Jahrzehnt Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Heft 34, Kommunalpolitik. Sankt Augustin.
- Adam, B. (2002): Einführung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 9/2002, I–III.
- Adam, B.; Göttsche-Stellmann, J.; Heidbrink, I. (2005): Metropolregionen als Forschungsgegenstand. Aktueller Stand, erste Ergebnisse und Perspektiven. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 7/2005, 417–430.
- Adam, B.; Göttsche-Stellmann, J. (2002): Metropolregionen. Konzepte, Definitionen und Herausforderungen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 9/2002, 513–526.
- ADEUS (Agence de developpement et d'urbanisme de l'agglomération strasbourgeoise) (2004): Livre Blanc/Weißbuch Strasbourg-Ortenau.
URL: <http://www.strasbourg-ortenu.org/all/bibliotheque.asp> (Abruf: 21.03.2007).
- Alker, H. (2007): Potentiale der Ländlichen Räume in Baden-Württemberg Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Antikainen, J. (2005): The concept of Functional Urban Area Findings of the ESPON project 1.1.1. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 7/2005, 447–456.
- Arbeitsgruppe Wirtschaft und Innovation innerhalb der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart (2005): Ergebnisprotokoll der 1. Sitzung am 08.11.2005; unv.
- Arbeitskreis Wirtschaft und Innovation der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart (2006): Sachstandsbericht, Stand März 2006; unv.
- Arbeitskreis Wissenschaft und Bildung der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart (2006): Ergebnisse der vorbereitenden Workshops für die Entscheidung der Themenfindungskommission am 17.03.2006 in Stuttgart; unv.
- ARE (2005): Raumentwicklungsbericht 2005: Neue Wege zu einer nachhaltigen Raumentwicklung.
URL: <http://www.are.admin.ch/dokumentation/00121/00224/index.html?lang=de&msg-id=740> (Abruf: 28.07.2008).
- ARE (Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung) (2005a): Raumentwicklungsbericht 2005: Neue Wege zu einer nachhaltigen Raumentwicklung; Medienmitteilung vom 18.03.2005.
URL: <http://www.are.admin.ch/are/de/medien/mitteilungen/03023/index.html> (Abruf: 25.03.2007).
- Aring, J. (2008): Europäische Metropolregionen – Annäherungen an eine raumordnerische Modernisierungsstrategie. In: ARL (Hrsg.): Reihe Forschungs- und Sitzungsberichte; in Druckvorbereitung.
- Aring, J. (2007): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Aring, J. (2006): Der Entstehungsprozess der neuen Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 613–620.
- Aring, J. (2005): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. Diskussionspapier vom 01.09.2005; unv. Manuskript.
- Aring, J. (2004): Modernisierung der Raumordnung. In: ILS NRW (Hrsg.): Ausgleich versus Wachstum – Paradigmenwechsel in der räumlichen Planung? (10. Konferenz für Planerinnen und Planer NRW).
URL: <http://www.ils-shop.nrw.de/down/planerkonf-2004.pdf>, 39–49.
- Aring, J.; Reutther, I. (2006): Regiopolen zwischen Metropolregionen und Peripherien.
URL: http://www.unikassel.de/fb6/srp/07forschung/regiopolen/060914tagung/Aufsatz_Tagung_Regiopolen_Aring_Reutther.pdf (Abruf: 28.07.2008).
- Aring, J.; Sinz, M. (2006): Neue Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung. Ein Impuls zur Modernisierung der Raumordnung? In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 6/2006, 451–459.
- ARL et al (Hrsg.) (2007): Metropolregionen – Innovation, Wettbewerb, Handlungsfähigkeit. Positionspapier aus der ARL Nr. 71, Hannover.
- ARL; DASL (Hrsg.) (2004): Strategien für Großstadtregionen im 21. Jahrhundert. Empfehlungen für ein Handlungsfeld von nationaler Bedeutung; Arbeitsmaterial der ARL Nr. 309. Berlin, Hannover.
- Augustin, T. (2006): Bundespolitische Handlungsmöglichkeiten – Politik für Ländliche Räume. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 659–663.

- Auphan, E., Brücher, W. (2005): Frankreichs (De-)Zentralisierung im Kontext der europäischen Integration. In: *Geographische Rundschau*, 9/2005, 4–11.
- Bachmann, M. (2005): Raus aus der Innenstadt? Standortwettbewerb von Dienstleistungsunternehmen in europäischen Metropolen. In: Kujath, H. (Hrsg.): *Knoten im Netz. Zur neuen Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Dienstleistungswirtschaft und Wissensökonomie*, 343–367. Münster.
- BAK Basel Economics (2006): Das Oberrheingebiet als europäische Metropolregion. Studie im Auftrag der Oberrheinkonferenz.
URL: http://www.oberrheinkonferenz.org/media/docs/84-Studie_Metropol.pdf (Abruf: 21.03.2007).
- Baumann, G. (2006): Gateway zur Internationalisierung – Welche strukturelle Funktionalität benötigt eine Metropolregion; Vortrag im Rahmen des Symposiums des Forum Region Stuttgart „Chancen und Potenziale einer Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart“ am 12.10.2006 in Stuttgart.
URL: http://www.forum-region-stuttgart.de/reden/2006/Baumann12_10_06.pdf (Abruf: 28.07.2008).
- BDI (Bundesverband der deutschen Industrie) (Hrsg.) (2006): *Innovationsindikator Deutschland 2006*. Berlin.
- Behrend, H.; Kruse, C. (2001): Die Europäische Metropolregion Zürich – die Entstehung des subpolitischen Raumes. In: *Geographica Helvetica*, 3, 202–213.
- Beier, M.; Matern, A. (2007): Stadt-Umland-Prozesse und interkommunale Zusammenarbeit. Stand und Perspektive der Forschung; Arbeitsmaterial der ARL Nr. 332, Hannover.
- Benz, A. (2005): Governance. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): *Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung*, 404–408. Hannover.
- Benz, A. (2003): Regional Governance mit organisatorischem Kern. Das Beispiel der Region Stuttgart. In: *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung* 8/9 2003, 505–512.
- BFAG; BBR und BMVBW (Hrsg.) (2005): *Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland*; Diskussionspapier; Stand 01.09.2005.
URL: http://www.bfag-arng.de/pdf-dokumente/Aring_2005_Leitbilder_Raumentwicklung_2005–09–01.pdf (Abruf: 19.12.2005).
- Blatter, J. (2008): Metropolitan Governance: Theoretische Formen, vielfältige Reformen und der aktuelle Nivellierungsdruck in deutschen Großstadregionen.
URL: <http://www.unilu.ch/files/blatter-metro-gov-in-d.pdf> (Abruf: 31.07.2008).
- Blöchliger, H. (2005): Baustelle Föderalismus. Metropolitanregionen versus Kantone: Untersuchungen und Vorschläge für eine Revitalisierung der Schweiz – Zusammenfassung.
URL: <http://www.avenir-suisse.ch/download.php?id=1754> (Abruf: 19.04.2005).
- Blotevogel, H. (2006): Metropolregionen in Europa. In: Ministerium für Infrastruktur und Raumordnung (Hrsg.): *Dokumentation der Fachkonferenz „Berlin-Brandenburg in Europa“*, 10–14. Berlin.
- Blotevogel, H. (2006a): Neuorientierung der Raumordnungspolitik? Die neuen „Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland“ in der Diskussion. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 6/2006, 460–472.
- Blotevogel, H. (2006b): Metropolregionen in der Raumordnungspolitik – Bloße Rhetorik oder Paradigmenwechsel. In: Hangebuch, N. et al (Hrsg.): *Agglomerationen – Situation und Perspektiven*, Arbeitsmaterial der ARL Nr. 325, 5–19. Hannover.
- Blotevogel, H. (2005): Neuformulierung des Zentrale-Orte-Konzeptes. Kurzfassung eines Vortrages im Rahmen einer Fachtagung des Ministeriums des Inneren und für . ort, Oberste Landesplanungsbehörde am 14.07.2005 in Budenheim bei Mainz .
URL: <http://www.raumplanung.uni-dortmund.de/rlp/Personal/Blotevogel/original/Neuformulierung%20ZOK%2020.02.06.pdf> .
- Blotevogel, H. (2005a): Metropolräume und ländliche Räume – eine Solidargemeinschaft? Schriftliche Fassung eines Vortrags im Rahmen des Fachkongresses „Leitlinien der niedersächsischen Landesentwicklungspolitik“ am 24.11.2005 in Hannover.
URL: http://www.raumplanung.uni-dortmund.de/rlp/Personal/Blotevogel/original/2006_Blotevogel_Leitlinien_Landesentwicklungspolitik.pdf (Abruf: 28.07.2008).
- Blotevogel, H. (2005b): Raumordnungs- und regionalpolitische Konzepte.
URL: <http://www.supplement.de/geographie/blotevog/raumord/index.htm> (Abruf: 19.12.2005).
- Blotevogel, H. (2005c): Metropolregionen. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): *Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung*, 642–647. Hannover.
- Blotevogel, H. (2003): Baustelle – Regionale Kooperationen im Ruhrgebiet. In: Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Landtag NRW (Hrsg.): *Fundament für die Metropolregion Ruhrgebiet schaffen – Dokumentation der Veranstaltung vom 6. Dezember 2002*, 40–59. Düsseldorf.

- Blotevogel, H. (2002): Deutsche Metropolregionen in der Vernetzung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 6/7, 2002, 345–351.
- Blotevogel, H. (2002a): Vernetzung von Metropolregionen. In: Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht, 35–36. Frankfurt am Main.
- Blotevogel, H. (1998): Europäische Metropolregion Rhein-Ruhr. Theoretische, empirische und politische Perspektiven eines neuen raumordnungspolitischen Konzepts. Schriften des Instituts für Landes- und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen 135. Dortmund.
- BMELV (Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz) (2008): Politik für ländliche Räume.
URL: http://www.bmelv.de/cln_045/nn_751686/SharedDocs/downloads/01Broschüren/KonzeptionWeiterentwicklungLaendlicherRaume,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/KonzeptionWeiterentwicklungLaendlicherRaume.pdf (Abruf: 28. 06. 2008).
- Borja, J.; Castells, M. (1997): Local and global: The Management of Cities in the Information Age. London.
- Brake, K. (2002): Strategiekonzepte und Leitbilder für Stadtregionen im 21. Jahrhundert. In: Mayr, A.; Meurer, M.; Vogt, J. (Hrsg.) (2002): Stadt und Region. Dynamik von Lebenswelten. Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. 53. Deutscher Geographentag, 684–691. Leipzig.
- Bronger, D. (2004): Metropolen, Megastädte, Global Cities. Die Metropolisierung der Erde. Darmstadt
- Brunotte, E. et al (Hrsg.) (2002): Lexikon der Geographie. Heidelberg, Berlin.
- Bullinger, F. (2005): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart; Schreiben vom 18.11.2005, Az 5R-2450.0/4; unv.
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR) (2008): Überregionale Partnerschaften – Innovative Projekte zur stadtreionalen Kooperation, Vernetzung und gemeinsamen großräumigen Verantwortung.
URL: http://www.bbr.bund.de/cln_007/nn_21288/DE/Forschungsprogramme/ModellvorhabenRaumordnung/Forschungsfelder/UeberregionalePartnerschaften/Stuttgart.html (Abruf: 25.07.2008).
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR) (Hrsg.) (2005): Raumordnungsbericht 2005. Bonn.
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR) (Hrsg.) (2004): Die Städte Europas, Heft 115. Bonn.
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR) (2001): Konkurrenz und Kooperation – Europas Metropolregionen vor neuen Herausforderungen; Informationen aus der Forschung des BBR, Nr. 5. Bonn.
- Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR); Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2006): Perspektiven der Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. Bonn, Berlin
- Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE) (Hrsg.) (2005): Raumentwicklungsbericht 2005.
URL: http://www.are.admin.ch/imperia/md/content/are/raumplanung/grundlagen/reb2_de.pdf (Abruf: 19.12.2005).
- Bundesministerium für Raumordnung, Bauwesen und Städtebau (1993): Raumordnungspolitische Orientierungsrahmen. Leitbilder für die räumliche Entwicklung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Bonn.
- Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2008): Erfolgsbedingungen von Wachstumsmotoren außerhalb der Metropolen, Werkstatt Praxis Heft 56.
- Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (2007): Territoriale Ausgangslage und Perspektiven der Europäischen Union. Stärkung der territorialen Kohäsion in Europa unter Berücksichtigung der Lissabon- und Göteborg-Strategien. Ein Hintergrunddokument für die Territoriale Agenda der Europäischen Union.
URL: http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_998208/Territoriale-Ausgangslage-und-Perspektiven-der-Europaeischen-Union.pdf (Abruf: 24.09.2007).
- Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2007a): Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland, Werkstatt Praxis Heft 52. Bonn.
- Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2005): Empfehlungen des Beirats für Raumordnung. 15te Legislaturperiode des Deutschen Bundestages. Bonn.
- Bundesrat (2001): Agglomerationspolitik des Bundes. Bern.
- Bundesregierung (2007): Stellungnahme der Bundesregierung zum Beschluss der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung vom 30.06.2006 „Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland“ unv. Manusk.; Entwurf Stand: 18.06.2007.
- Burdack, J. (2004): Die Ville de Lumières und ihre Schatten. In: Geographische Rundschau 56/2004/4, 32–39.

- Butzin, B. (2003): „Zukünfte im Ruhrgebiet“ – Eine kritische Zwischenbilanz. In: Bischoff, C.; Krajewski, C. (Hrsg.) (2003): Beiträge zur geographischen Stadt- und Regionalforschung. Festschrift für Heinz Heineberg; Münstersche Geographische Arbeiten, Heft 46, 57–68. Münster.
- Brunet, R. (1989): Les villes européennes. Rapport pour la DATAR. Montpellier.
- Carrière, J. (2005): Une réflexion sur la construction du polycentrisme en Europe: apports et limites du rapport Potentials for polycentric development in Europe. In: Territoires 2030, N.1, 47–64.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Castells, M. (2004): Der Aufstieg der Netzwerkgesellschaft. Opladen.
- CIADT (Comité interministériel de l'aménagement et du développement du territoire) (2003): Pour un rayonnement européen des métropoles françaises éléments de diagnostic et orientations.
URL: [http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_ciadt.nsf/3f47f4f1617cd01fc1256591003b315f/c541530f236d3a7fc1256e00003261c4/\\$FILE/DocumentM%C3%A9tropol%C3%A9.pdf](http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_ciadt.nsf/3f47f4f1617cd01fc1256591003b315f/c541530f236d3a7fc1256e00003261c4/$FILE/DocumentM%C3%A9tropol%C3%A9.pdf) (Abruf: 20.03.2007).
- Cichorowski, G. (2003): Wissenschaftsforum: Zukunft Rhein-Main. Erfolgsfaktoren regionaler Wirtschaftsentwicklung. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung, 1/2/2003, 118–123.
- Cicille, P., Rozenblat, C. (2003): Les villes européennes. Paris.
- Danielzyk, R. (2007): Strategien von Wachstumsregionen in peripheren Räumen – Das Beispiel Emsland. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 51–60. Hannover.
- Danielzyk, R. (2003): Die Rolle der Raumordnung bei der Entwicklung und Planung von Stadtregionen. In: Bischoff, C.; Krajewski, C. (Hrsg.) (2003): Beiträge zur geographischen Stadt- und Regionalforschung. Festschrift für Heinz Heineberg; Münstersche Geographische Arbeiten, Heft 46, 193–200. Münster.
- Danielzyk, R.; Rietzel, R. (2003): Regionalplanung als Motor regionaler Kooperation. Das Beispiel Oderland-Spree. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9/2003, 513–521.
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (2006): De la DATAR à la DIACT.
URL: [http://www.datar.gouv.fr/Datar_Site/DIACT.nsf/\(vn_doc\)/11ABDC2CCE8E6750C12570EE0048E818](http://www.datar.gouv.fr/Datar_Site/DIACT.nsf/(vn_doc)/11ABDC2CCE8E6750C12570EE0048E818) (Abruf: 04.04.2006).
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (Hrsg.) (2005): Dynamiques et diversité des territoires français. Rapport de l'observatoire des territoires. Paris.
- DATAR (2005a): Dossier pour le Ministre; unv.
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (2005b): Pressemitteilung vom 09.08.2005 «Résultats de l'appel à coopération métropolitaine». Paris.
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (2004): Rapport d'activité 2004.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/home_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (2003): Une nouvelle politique de développement des territoires pour la France. Paris.
- DATAR (Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale) (2002): Le Sud-Est. Aménager la France de 2020. Contribution de l'état à de nouveaux enjeux interrégionaux. Paris.
- David, C. (2005): Zur Konvergenz der nationalen Raumordnungspolitiken Frankreichs und Deutschlands im Post-EUREK-Prozess. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 1/2005, 11–20.
- DB (Deutsche Bundesbahn) (2007): Rhein/Main–Rhein/Neckar: Bindeglied im Transeuropäischen Netz.
URL: http://www.db.de/site/bahn/de/unternehmen/bahnwelt/bauprojekte/ausbau_neubau/rheinmain_rheinneckar/rheinmain_rheinneckar.html (Abruf: 02.02.2008).
- DIFU (Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik) (2004): Interkommunale Kooperation in baden-württembergischen Stadtregionen. Stuttgart, Karlsruhe und Freiburg. Berlin.
- Diller, C.; Knieling, J. (2003): Metropolregion Hamburg. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 3/2003, 198–210.
- Dohnanyi, K.; Most, E. (2004): Kurskorrektur des Aufbau Ost. Bericht des Gesprächskreises Ost der Bundesregierung.
URL: [http://www2.tu-berlin.de/ztg/innovationsverbund-ostdeutschlandforschung/download/04-06-28_Dohnanyi_Aufbau_Ost\[1\].pdf](http://www2.tu-berlin.de/ztg/innovationsverbund-ostdeutschlandforschung/download/04-06-28_Dohnanyi_Aufbau_Ost[1].pdf) (Abruf: 26.05.2008).
- Drautz, R. (2007): Die Rolle der Regionen in der Landesentwicklung. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.

- Editorial Group (2006): The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union Document – Towards a Stronger European Territorial Cohesion in the Light of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Ambitions.
URL: http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_963670/Dokument-Territorial-State-and-Perspectives-of-the-EU.pdf (Abruf: 01.08.2006).
- Einig, K. et al (2006): Analytische Grundlagen der Leitbilder. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 621–636.
- Einig, K. et al (2005): Urban Governance. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 9/10 2005, I–IX.
- Einig, K. (2003): Positive Koordination in der Regionalplanung: Transaktionskosten des Planentwurfs in Verhandlungssystemen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 479–503.
- Einig, K. et al (2003): Aktionsraum Region – Regional Governance. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, I–VI.
- Eisenreich, D. (1999): Befragung von unternehmensorientierten Dienstleistungsbetrieben in der Filderregion; Kurzfassung; unv. Tübingen.
- Esparre, S. (Hrsg.) (2007): Les villes moyennes françaises. Enjeux et perspectives. Paris.
- ESPON Monitoring Committee (2005): ESPON 1.1.1 Potentials for polycentric development in Europe; Project report. Stockholm.
- Esser, J.; Weiß, S. (2005): Globalisierung. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 397–404. Hannover.
- Eurodistrikt Strasbourg-Ortenau (o. J.): Vereinbarung über die Gründung des Eurodistrikts Straßburg-Ortenau.
URL: http://www.espaces-transfrontaliers.org/document/convention_eurodistrict_st_ort.pdf (Abruf: 04.07.2006).
- Eurodistrikt Strasbourg-Ortenau (2004): Livre Blanc/Weißbuch Strasbourg-Ortenau.
URL: <http://www.strasbourg-ortenu.org/all/bibliotheque.asp> (Abruf: 04.07.2006).
- Europabüros der bayerischen, baden-württembergischen und sächsischen Kommunen (2007): Metropolregionen und ländlicher Raum: (K)ein Gegensatz. In: Brüssel aktuell 20/2007, 6–7.
- Europäische Kommission (2001): European Governance a white paper.
http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0428en01.pdf (Abruf: 04.04.2006).
- Europäische Kommission (2000): The EU compendium of spatial planning systems and policies – France
- Europäische Kommission (1999): EUREK Europäisches Raumentwicklungskonzept. Potsdam.
- Europäische Union (2007): Territoriale Agenda der Europäischen Union 2007.
URL: http://www.bmvbs.de/Anlage/original_998207/Territoriale-Agenda-der-Europaeischen-Union-Angenommen-am-25.-Mai-2007-barrierefrei.pdf (Abruf: 24.09.2007).
- Europäischer Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss (EWSA) (2004): Stellungnahme zum Thema „Die großstädtischen Ballungsgebiete: sozioökonomische Auswirkungen auf die Zukunft Europas“; unv.
- FDP-Fraktion im Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2006): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart (EMS). Nachhaltige Raumentwicklung durch abgestimmte Regionalplanung, Tischvorlage zur Sitzung des Planungsausschusses in Mössingen, 07.03.2006; unv.
- Feil, H.-J. (2005): Regional Governance am Beispiel der Metropolregion Hamburg. Kleger, H. (Hrsg.): Region, Nation, Europa Band 32. Münster, Hamburg, London.
- Fischer, C. et al (2005): Rhein-Main als polyzentrische Metropolregion. Zur Geographie der Standortnetze von wissensintensiven Dienstleistungsunternehmen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 7/2005, 439–446.
- Fischer, T.; Frech, S. (2001): „Vier Motoren für Europa“ – Baden-Württembergs Partnerregionen. In: Fischer, T.; Frech, S. (Hrsg.): Baden-Württemberg und seine Partnerregionen, 9–15. Stuttgart.
- Forum Region Stuttgart (Hrsg.) (2008): Abschluss-Symposium Regionale Entwicklungsperspektiven – Chancen und Perspektiven einer Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart. Stuttgart.
- Forum Region Stuttgart (Hrsg.) (2007): Jahresbericht 2007. Regionale Entwicklungsperspektiven in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart. Stuttgart.
- Fouchier, V. (2005): Avant-propos. In: Territoires 2030, N.1, 7–9.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Frankenfeld, P. (2005): Disparitäten, regionale. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 185–190. Hannover.

- Franz, W. (2005): Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – die wirtschaftliche Dimension. In: Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar: Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22.02.2005 in Mannheim.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf, 11 (Abruf: 28.07.2008).
- Frey, R. (2003): Regional Governance zur Selbststeuerung territorialer Subsysteme. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 451–462.
- Frey, R. (2002): Grenzüberschreitende Kooperation zur Stärkung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von städtischen Regionen am Beispiel der RegioTriRhena. In: Mayr, A.; Meurer, M.; Vogt, J. (Hrsg.) (2002): Stadt und Region. Dynamik von Lebenswelten. Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. 3. Deutscher Geographentag, 128–139. Leipzig.
- Fürst, D. (2008): Metropolregionen, Wissensregion und Governance. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 3/2008, 219–229.
- Fürst, D. (2005): Netzwerke. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 710–712. Hannover.
- Fürst, D. (2003): Steuerung auf regionaler Ebene versus Regional Governance. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 441–450.
- Gabi, S.; Thierstein, A. (2005): Der „Regionalpark“ als Handlungsfeld der Metropolitan Governance. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 1/2005, 21–31.
- Gaebe, W. (2003): Region Stuttgart – Ein wirtschaftsstarker Raum mit strukturellen Schwächen. In: Bischoff, C.; Krajewski, C. (Hrsg.) (2003): Beiträge zur geographischen Stadt- und Regionalforschung. Festschrift für Heinz Heineberg; Münstersche Geographische Arbeiten, 46, 81–88. Münster.
- Gaebe, W. (1997): Stärken und Schwächen der Region Stuttgart im interregionalen Vergleich. In: Gaebe, W. (Hrsg.): Struktur und Dynamik in der Region Stuttgart, 9–31. Stuttgart.
- Gatzweiler, H.-P. (2006): Leitbilder in der Praxis. Impulse zur Umsetzung durch Modellvorhaben der Raumordnung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 677–691.
- Gerhard, U. (2004): Global Cities. Anmerkungen zu einem aktuellen Forschungsfeld. In: Geographische Rundschau, 4/2004, 4–11.
- Gloersen, E. (2005): Faut-il des visions spatiales pour construire une Europe polycentrique. In: Territoires 2030, N.1, 65–88.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Glückler, J. (2004): Geographien der Vernetzung und Skalen der Globalisierung. Das Beispiel der Unternehmensberatung in Frankfurt. In: Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen, 4/2004, 28–37.
- Göddecke-Stellmann, J. et al (2005): Den Blick schärfen. Eine kritische Bestandsaufnahme des Konzepts funktionaler Stadtregionen im ESPON-Programm. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 7/2005, 457–464.
- Goppel, K. (2006): Wesentliche Akzentsetzungen in den Leitbildern für Raumentwicklung aus Sicht der bayerischen Landesentwicklung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 645–651.
- Grabski-Kieron, U. (2007): Entwicklung ländlicher Räume in Deutschland und der EU unter veränderten strukturpolitischen Rahmenbedingungen – Perspektiven für Planung und angewandte Forschung. In: Malburg-Graf, B. (Hrsg.): Flächenmanagement als Instrument der integrativen Planung für ländliche Räume und der kommunalen Innenentwicklung, Stuttgarter Geographische Studien 140, 28–45. Stuttgart.
- Grasselli, V.; Wütz, B. (2007): Europäischer Verflechtungsraum Bodensee; Schreiben an den Wirtschaftsminister des Landes Baden-Württemberg vom 23.01.2007; unv.
- Guigou, J. (2000): Aménager la France 2020 – mettre les territoires en mouvement. Paris.
- Guigou, J. (1995): Voir la France en systèmes urbains. In: Métropolis 104/105, 18–20.
- Hahn, R. (1997): Deindustrialisierungsprozesse in der Region Stuttgart? Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um den aktuellen Strukturwandel. In: Gaebe, W. (Hrsg.): Struktur und Dynamik in der Region Stuttgart, 71–81. Stuttgart.
- Hahne, U. (2006): Der Rand der Verantwortungsgemeinschaft – Ländliche Räume und die Neuinterpretation des Gleichwertigkeitsziels. In: Agrarsoziale Gesellschaft e.V. (Hrsg.): Ländliche Räume zwischen Lissabon-Strategie und Metropolregionen, 49–63. Göttingen.

- Halbert, L. (2005): Les métropoles, moteurs de la dématérialisation du système productif urbain français: une lecture sectorielle et fonctionnelle (1982–1999). In: Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français 3/2005, 279–297.
- Hamann, P. (2005): Vers un intérêt général transfrontalier? Projets communs sur la frontière franco-allemand. In: Annales de la recherche urbaine, 99, 103–110.
- Harlander, T.; Jessen, J. (2001): Stuttgart – polyzentrale Stadtregion im Strukturwandel. In: Brake, K. et al (Hrsg.): Suburbanisierung in Deutschland. Aktuelle Tendenzen, 187–199. Opladen.
- Hauk, P. (2007): Tagung zum Thema „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume – ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik?“ In: Königsfeld; Pressemitteilung 54/2007 des Ministeriums für Ernährung und Ländlichen Raum Baden-Württemberg.
- Hege, H.; Torns, F. (2007): Wissensregionen – Die Beispiele Frankfurt/Rhein-Main und Rhein-Neckar. In: Bieker, S. et al (Hrsg.): Räumliche Planung im Wandel – Welche Instrumente haben Zukunft; Arbeitsmaterial der ARL Nr. 338, 55–67. Hannover.
- Heineberg, H. (2000): Grundriß Allgemeine Geographie: Stadtgeographie. Paderborn.
- Herdzina, K.; Blessin, B. (1996): Strategische Unternehmensführung als Erfolgsfaktor im Wettbewerb. Kleinere und mittlere Unternehmen der Region Neckar-Alb im Strukturwandel. Hohenheim.
- Herschel, T.; Newman, P. (2003): Die Governance europäischer Stadtregionen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 543–555.
- Hicklin, M. (2006): metrobasel report 2006.
URL: http://www.metrobasel.org/downloads/projekte/report/r0001d99metrobasel_report_2006_de.pdf (Abruf: 19.06.2008).
- Hilligardt, J. (2003): Erfolgreiche Initiierung von freiwilligen regionalen Kooperationen zur Umsetzung einer nachhaltigen Regionalentwicklung. Wirtschaft. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung, 1/2/2003, 98–106.
- Hoyler, M. (2005): Transnationale Organisationsstrukturen, vernetzte Städte: ein Ansatz zur Analyse der globalen Verflechtung von Metropolregionen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, 7/2005, 431–438.
- Hoyler, M. (2005a): Finanzmetropolen im globalen Städtesystem: weltweite Vernetzungen und das Beispiel London/Frankfurt. In: Kujath, H. (Hrsg.): Knoten im Netz. Zur neuen Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Dienstleistungswirtschaft und Wissensökonomie, 225–244. Münster.
- Hoyler, M. (2004): London und Frankfurt als Weltstädte. Globale Dienstleistungszentren zwischen Kooperation und Wettbewerb. In: Geographische Rundschau, 4/2004, 26–31.
- Hübler, K. (2005): Die Schaffung gleichwertiger Lebensbedingungen in allen Teilräumen. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 1/2005, 55–62.
- Huf, B. (2003): Planungsverband Frankfurt/Rhein-Main. In: Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Landtag NRW (Hrsg.): Fundament für die Metropolregion Ruhrgebiet schaffen – Dokumentation der Veranstaltung vom 6.12.2002, 18–26. Düsseldorf.
- Ibert, O. (2003): Projekt und Innovation. Projektorientierung in der Entwicklungsplanung als Antwort auf das Problem der Organisation von Innovation. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung, Heft 1/2/2003, 3–12.
- IBK (Internationale Bodenseekonferenz) (2008): Leitbild der Internationalen Bodensee Konferenz (IBK) für den Bodenseeraum.
URL: <http://www.bodenseekonferenz.org/20544/Leitbild/index.aspx> (Abruf: 18.07.2008).
- IHK (Industrie- und Handelskammer Reutlingen) (2006): Forderungskatalog Tourismus Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart; unv.
- Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (IKM) (2008): Homepage des Initiativkreises.
URL: <http://www.deutsche-metropolregionen.org/ueber-ikm.html> (Abruf: 19.06.2008).
- Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (IKM) (2006): Stellungnahme des Initiativkreises Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (IKM) zum Arbeitsdokument der Kommissionsdienststellen „Die Kohäsionspolitik und die Städte: Der Beitrag der Städte zu Wachstum und Beschäftigung in den Regionen.“
URL: http://www.deutsche-metropolregionen.org/_material/IKM-Stellungnahme-Cohesion%20Policy%20and%20Cities060216.pdf (Abruf: 12.07.2006).
- Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (IKM) (2005): Stellungnahme des Initiativkreises Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland zur erneuerten Lissabon-Agenda.
URL: http://www.deutsche-metropolregionen.org/_material/StellungnahmeLissabon050830.pdf (Abruf: 12.07.2006).

- Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (2005a): Stellungnahme des Initiativkreises Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland zur Fortschreibung der raumordnerischen Leitbilder für das Bundesgebiet und den europäischen Raum.
URL: http://www.deutsche-metropolregionen.org/_material/IKM-Stellungnahme2-MKRO050119.pdf
(Abruf: 12.07.2006).
- Initiativkreis Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland (2004): Stellungnahme des Initiativkreises Europäische Metropolregionen in Deutschland zur Fortschreibung der raumordnerischen Leitbilder für das Bundesgebiet und den europäischen Raum.
URL: http://www.deutsche-metropolregionen.org/_material/IKM-Stellungnahme-MKRO040927.pdf
(Abruf: 12.07.2006).
- Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln Consult GmbH (2005): Deutsche Großstädte im Vergleich. Köln.
- Iwer, F. et al (2002): Strukturwandel und regionale Kooperation. Arbeitsorientierte Strukturpolitik in der Region Stuttgart. Marburg.
- Jarothe, S. (2001): Entwicklung der Räume zwischen den Metropolregionen am Beispiel Bayerns. In: Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht zur Fachkonferenz am 13.12.2001 in Frankfurt am Main, 37–39. Frankfurt.
- Jessen, J. (2002): Planungskulturen und Steuerungsformen in der französischen Stadtplanung zwischen Standortprofilierung und sozialem Ausgleich. In: Mayr, A.; Meurer, M.; Vogt, J. (Hrsg.) (2002): Stadt und Region. Dynamik von Lebenswelten. Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. 53. Deutscher Geographentag Leipzig, 718–726. Leipzig.
- John, G. (2006): Leitbilder für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland – eine finanzpolitische Betrachtung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 671–676.
- Jouve, B. (2003): Les formes de gouvernement urbain en Europe. In: DISP 152/2003, 37–42.
- Jouve, B.; Lefèvre, C. (2002): Le nouvel âge d'or des villes européennes? In: Jouve, B.; Lefèvre, C. (Hrsg.): Métropoles ingouvernables, 13–37. Paris.
- Kaltenegger, C. (2006): Die Bedeutung von Metropolregionen im europäischen Vergleich. Entwicklung – Ziele – Strategien – Umsetzung ; Diplomarbeit Technische Universität Kaiserslautern.
- Kamal-Chaoui, L. (2005): Gouvernance et compétitivité des métropoles: quel rôle pour les gouvernements centraux. In: Territoires 2030, N.1, 203–217.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument
(Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Kaufmann, R. (2007): Möglichkeiten der Regionalpolitik. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Kawka, R. (2007): Wachstumsregionen in Deutschland – empirische Befunde. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 36–50. Hannover.
- Klemmer, P. (2005): Gemeinschaftsaufgabe „Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur“. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 366–369. Hannover.
- Knieling, J. (2006): Leitbilder und strategische Raumentwicklung. Planungstheoretische Einordnung und Diskussion der neuen Leitbilder für die deutsche Raumentwicklung. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 6/2006, 473–485.
- Knieling, J. (2003): Kooperative Regionalplanung und Regional Governance: Praxisbeispiele, Theoriebezüge und Perspektiven. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 463–478.
- Knieling, J. (2001): Spielräume für Kooperation zwischen benachbarten Metropolregionen – am Beispiel der Metropolregionen Berlin-Hamburg. In: Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht zur Fachkonferenz am 13.12.2001 in Frankfurt am Main, 43–49. Frankfurt.
- Knox, P.; Taylor, P. (Hrsg.) (1995): World cities in a world-system. Cambridge.
- Köhler, S. (2007): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen – Eine Einführung im Kontext aktueller Raumordnungspolitik. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 1–7. Hannover.
- Köhler, S. (2007a): Zukunftsregion Bodensee-Oberschwaben. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 104–115. Hannover.

- Köhler, S. (2007b): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen – Zusammenfassung und Ausblick. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 116–118. Hannover.
- König, M. (2007): Die Europäische Metropolregion: Neuer Vertreter regionaler Interessen. Politischer Lobbyismus durch die Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Marburg.
- König, W. (2007): Die Europäische Metropolregion als steuerungstheoretisches Problem. Politische und gesellschaftliche Initiativen zum Aufbau der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Marburg.
- Köppen, B. (2006): Metropolregionen ohne Metropolen? Kritische Anmerkungen zur Bewertung des deutschen Städtesystems in aktuellen Strategie- und Planungsdiskursen. In: Europäisches Zentrum für Föderalismus-Forschung (Hrsg.): Jahrbuch des Föderalismus 2006. Föderalismus, Subsidiarität und Regionen Europas, 286–299. Baden-Baden.
- Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften (2005): Die Kohäsionspolitik und die Städte: Der Beitrag der Städte zu Wachstum und Beschäftigung in den Regionen.
URL: http://www.deutscher-verband.org/seiten/urban-netzwerk/downloads/2005-11-17_KOM-Kohäsionspolitik_und_Staedte-DE.pdf (Abruf: 01.08.2006).
- KoRis et al (2004): Handlungskonzept für die Metropolregion Halle/Leipzig-Sachsendreieck; Entwurf; unv.
- Krätke, S. (2007): Europas Stadtsystem zwischen Metropolisierung und Globalisierung: Profile und Entwicklungspfade der Großstadregionen Europas im Strukturwandel zur wissensintensiven Wirtschaft. Münster.
- Krätke, S. (2005): Wissensintensive Wirtschaftsaktivitäten im Regionalsystem der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Clusterpotentiale und Beitrag zur regionalen Wirtschaftsleistung. In: Kujath, H. (Hrsg.): Knoten im Netz. Zur neuen Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Dienstleistungswirtschaft und Wissensökonomie, 159–201. Münster.
- Kreibich, J. (2006): Den Stuttgartern Paroli bieten. In: Reutlinger Generalanzeiger, 05.07.2006, 23.
- Kübler, D. (2004): La métropole et le politique. Gouvernance, institutions et citoyenneté dans les agglomérations en suisse. In: Zepf, M. (Hrsg.): Concerner, gouverner et concevoir les espaces publics urbains. Lausanne.
- Kübler, D. (2003): „Metropolitan Governance“ oder: Die unendliche Geschichte der Institutionenbildung in Stadregionen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 8/9 2003, 535–541.
- Kujath, H. (2005): Deutsche Metropolregionen als Knoten in europäischen Netzwerken. Geographische Rundschau, 3/2005, 20–27.
- Kujath, H. (2005a): Einleitung. Metropolregionen – Die Bedeutung von Metropolregionen für die Wissensökonomie. In: Kujath, H. (Hrsg.): Knoten im Netz. Zur neuen Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Dienstleistungswirtschaft und Wissensökonomie, 9–19. Münster.
- Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.) (2001): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht zur Fachkonferenz am 13.12.2001. Frankfurt am Main.
- Kulinat, K. (1997): Die Attraktivität von Stadt und Region Stuttgart. In: Gaebe, W. (Hrsg.): Struktur und Dynamik in der Region Stuttgart; 98–114. Stuttgart.
- Kulke, E. (2004): Ansätze wirtschaftsgeographischer Betrachtung von Dienstleistungen. In: Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen, 4/2004, 6–15.
- Kunzmann, K. (2002): Fünf Thesen zur transnationalen Zusammenarbeit europäischer Metropolregionen. In: Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht zur Fachkonferenz am 13.12.2001 in Frankfurt am Main, 15–18. Frankfurt.
- Kunzmann, K. (2001): L'aménagement du territoire en Allemagne: une discipline sans utopies. In: Territoires 2020, N. 4, 101–115.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 09.03.2006).
- Laaser, C.; Soltwedel, R. (2005): Raumstrukturen der New Economy – Tod der Distanz? Niedergang der Städte? In: Kujath, H. (Hrsg.): Knoten im Netz. Zur neuen Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Dienstleistungswirtschaft und Wissensökonomie, 65–107. Münster.
- Länder-Arbeitsgruppe (2006): Positionspapier „Politik für die ländlichen Räume der Länder-Arbeitsgruppe“; unv.
- Landratsamt Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis (2006): Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis im Verband Region Rhein-Neckar der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar; unv.

- Landtag von Baden-Württemberg (2006): Baden-Württemberg in Europa. Bericht an den Landtag von Baden-Württemberg über die Europapolitik der Landesregierung im Jahre 2003/2004. Landtagsdrucksache 13/3430. Stuttgart.
- Landtag von Baden-Württemberg (2005): Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck als Europäische Metropolregion; Drucksache 13/4067. Stuttgart.
- Landtag von Baden-Württemberg (2005a): Stärkung der europäischen Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar; Drucksache 13/4450. Stuttgart.
- Landtag von Baden-Württemberg (2001): Gesetzesbeschluss des Landtags. Gesetz über die Weiterentwicklung der Regionen und zur Änderung des Landesabfallgesetzes. Landtagsdrucksache 12/6036. Stuttgart.
- Langhagen-Rohrbach, C. (2003): Räumliche Planung in Deutschland und der Schweiz im Vergleich; Rhein-Mainische Forschungen 123. Frankfurt.
- Leber, N.; Kunzmann, K. (2006): Entwicklungsperspektiven ländlicher Räume in Zeiten des Metropolienfiebers. In: *disP* 166 3/2006, 58–70.
- Lehmann, S. et al (2007): Anerkennung des „Europäischen Verflechtungsraums Bodensee“. Antrag der Grünen beim Landtag von Baden-Württemberg; Aktenzeichen Drs 14/896 vom 09.02.2007; unv.
- Liebel, C. (2005): Das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregionen – Analyse und Bewertung der potentiellen Metropolregion Nürnberg; Arbeitsmaterialien zur Raumordnung und Raumplanung der Universität Bayreuth 237. Bayreuth.
- Liefner, I. (2003): Forschungspotenziale von Universitäten und Wirtschaft. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*, 1/2/2003, 68–82.
- Liquet, V. (2006): Contrats d'agglomération: dé (crédit)bilisés. In: *Traits urbains* 10/2006, 58–59.
- Lowack, W. (2006): Newsletter der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar, Ausgabe 1/2006.
- Ludwig, J. et al (2008) (Hrsg.): Metropolregionen in Deutschland. Baden-Baden.
- Ludwig, J.; Steinacher, B. (2008): Kräfte bündeln in der Metropolregion Stuttgart. In: Ludwig, J. et al (2008) (Hrsg.): Metropolregionen in Deutschland, 168–182. Baden-Baden.
- Ludwig, J. (2004): Neue Planungskultur in der Regionalentwicklung. Erarbeitungsverfahren und Strategien Regionaler Entwicklungskonzepte in Bayern, Arbeitsmaterialien zur Raumordnung und Raumplanung der Universität Bayreuth 228. Bayreuth.
- Lütke-Daldrup, E. (2008): Vorwort. In: Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) (Hrsg.) (2008): Erfolgsbedingungen von Wachstumsmotoren außerhalb der Metropolen, Werkstatt Praxis 56, o. S. Bonn.
- Luick, R.; Megerle, H. (2008): Neue Rahmenbedingungen für ländliche Räume – innovative Regionalentwicklungsstrategien und zukunftsfähige akademische Berufsprofile als Antwort auf Globalisierung und Paradigmenwechsel der Raumentwicklung. In: Malburg-Graf, B. (Hrsg.): Flächenmanagement als Instrument der integrativen Planung für ländliche Räume und der kommunalen Innenentwicklung. Beiträge des 2. Hochschultages 2007 „Strukturentwicklung ländlicher Raum in Baden-Württemberg“, 52–70. Stuttgart.
- Lutter, H. (2006): Neue Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 6/2006, 441–450.
- Mahler, H. (2007): Leistungsfähige Kommunen im Ländlichen Raum. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Maire de grandes villes (2005): Étude No 210. Le positionnement européen des métropoles françaises. URL: http://www.grandesvilles.org/IMG/Etude_210.pdf (Abruf: 30.07.2008).
- Mandel, K. (2008): Regional Governance – Made by Rhein-Neckar: Das neue Organisationsmodell für die Region. In: Ludwig, J. et al (2008) (Hrsg.): Metropolregionen in Deutschland, 130–142. Baden-Baden.
- Megerle, H. (2008): Von der „ville en crise“ zur Metropolitan European Growth Area: Aktuelle Transformationsprozesse der Metropolregion Marseille – Aix-en-Provence. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 01/2008, 23–35.
- Megerle, H. (2008a): Metropolregionen in Frankreich. Aktuelle Tendenzen der französischen Raumentwicklungspolitik. In: *PlanerIn* 1/08, 38–41.
- Megerle, H. (2008b): Ländlicher Raum und Metropolregionen: Verantwortungsgemeinschaft oder Widerspruch? In: *PlanerIn* (zum Druck angenommen).
- Megerle, H. (2007): Werkstattbericht. Metropolregionen in Baden-Württemberg: aktueller Stand und Perspektiven. In: Deutsche Akademie für Städtebau und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Metropolregionen –

- neue Dimensionen der Europäischen Stadt? Vorbereitender Bericht zur Jahrestagung 2007 in Nürnberg, 45–58. Berlin.
- Megerle, H.; Eberle, D. (2005): Umwelt- und Landschaftsplanung in Räumen hoher Nutzungsdiversität: Herausforderungen, Konflikte, Lösungsstrategien am Beispiel des Bodenseeraumes. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 05/ 2005, 351–359.
- Merkel, E. (2006): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart; Zugehörigkeit der Region Neckar-Alb. Schreiben vom 18.04.2006 an das Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg; unv.
- Merkel, E. (2006a): Weiterentwicklung der Kooperation in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart; Unterlagen zu Tagesordnungspunkt 2 des Planungsausschusses; 07.03.2006; unv.
- Merkel, E. (2005): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart, Schreiben vom 08.11.2005, az 01.151/309.56 gu-ku; unv.
- Merlin, P. (2007): L'aménagement du territoire en France, la documentation française. Paris.
- METREX (2006): METREX das Netzwerk der europäischen Ballungs- und Großräume. Broschüre.
URL: http://www.eurometrex.org/Docs/About/DE_Brochure.pdf (Abruf: 11.04.2006).
- METREX (2006a): Talents, Tolerance, Technology – The Metropolitan Future of Europe.
URL: <http://www.eurometrex.org/Docs/Bulletins/stuttgart/TTTFindings.pdf> (Abruf: 01.08.2006).
- METREX (2004): Positionspapier hinsichtlich zukünftiger Strukturfonds. Von Städten zu Metropolregionen : Eine erweiterte Perspektive als Notwendigkeit.
URL: http://www.eurometrex.org/Docs/Meetings/barcelona_2004/DE_Barca_GA_Minutes.pdf (Abruf: 04.04.2006).
- Metrobasel (2008): Homepage der Metropolitanregion Basel.
URL: <http://www.metrobasel.org/wDeutsch/index.php> (Abruf: 19.06.2008).
- Metrobasel (2006): Vision „metrobasel 2020“.
URL: http://www.metrobasel.org/downloads/projekte/vision/v0002d99vision_mb2020_061117.pdf (Abruf: 19.06.2008).
- Metropolregion Hamburg (2004): metropolnews, Heft 1/2004.
- Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar (2008): Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar, Homepage.
URL: <http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/> (Abruf: 25.07.2008).
- Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar (2006): Newsletter der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar Ausgabe 1/2006.
- Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar (2006a): Newsletter der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar Ausgabe 2/2006.
- Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar (2006b): Newsletter der Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar Ausgabe 3/2006.
- Michel, D. (1998): Das Netz der europäischen Metropolregionen in Deutschland. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 5/6, 362–369.
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (2006): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien der Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 703724.
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (2005): Beschluss der 32. Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung am 28.04.2005 in Berlin. Berlin.
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (2001): Leitlinien zur Anwendung des Zentrale-Orte-Konzepts als Instrument einer nachhaltigen Raumentwicklung; Entschließung der MKRO vom 03.12.2001.
URL: <http://www.isl.uni-karlsruhe.de/module/christaller/mkro2001.pdf> (Abruf: 03.04.2006).
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (1997): Zur Reform der europäischen Strukturfonds. Entschließung vom 3. Juni 1997. In: Bundesministerium für Raumordnung, Bauwesen und Städtebau (Hrsg.) (1997): Entschließungen der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung 1993-1997, 43–45. Bonn.
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (1997a): Bedeutung der großen Metropolregionen Deutschlands für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland und Europa. Beschluss vom 3.06.1997. In: Bundesministerium für Raumordnung, Bauwesen und Städtebau (Hrsg.) (1997): Entschließungen der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung 1993-1997, 51–60. Bonn.
- Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung (MKRO) (1995): Raumordnungspolitischer Handlungsrahmen. Bonn.
- Miosga, M. (2007): Einführung: Metropolregionen als Instrument der Raumentwicklung. In: Miosga, M.; Saller, R. (Hrsg.): Wie viel „Governance“ braucht eine Metropolregion? Überlegungen zur organisatorischen und inhaltlichen Ausgestaltung der Metropolregion München; Arbeitsmaterial der ARL Nr. 339, 1–14. Hannover.
- MLR (Ministerium Ländlicher Raum Baden-Württemberg) (2008): Ziel 2-Gebiete in Baden-Württemberg 2000–2006.
URL: <http://www.mlr.baden-wuerttemberg.de/mlr/allgemein/KarteZiel2.pdf> (Abruf: 04.08.2008).

- Mönnich, E. (2005): Ruinöse Einwohnerkonkurrenz. Eine Analyse von Suburbanisierungsproblemen am Beispiel der Region Bremen. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 1/2005, 32–46.
- Monod, J.; Castelbajac de, P. (2004): *L'aménagement du territoire*. Paris.
- Morel, B. (2006): Les reconstructions territoriales en France. In: *Rives nord-méditerranéennes* 25/2006, 43–52.
- Mose, I. (2005): Ländliche Räume. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): *Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung*, 573–579. Hannover.
- Müller, B. (2003): Regionalentwicklung unter Schrumpfbedingungen. Herausforderung für die Raumplanung in Deutschland. In: *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*, Band 61, Heft 1/2, 28–42.
- Müller, H. (2007): Stuttgart ist spitze.
URL: <http://www.manager-magazin.de/unternehmen/artikel/0,2828,477645,00.html> (Abruf: 31.07.2008).
- Nonn, H.; Woessner, R.; Poindron, P. (2005): BioValley, un pôle de compétitivité transfrontalier et multi-métropolitain. In: *Territoires 2030*, N.1, 149–158.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Odermatt, A. (2004): La Suisse s'oriente-t-elle vers une politique nationale des villes et agglomérations? In: *Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français* 2004, 4, 647–660.
- Paal, M. (2005): Metropolen im Wettbewerb, Tertiärisierung und Dienstleistungsspezialisierung in europäischen Agglomerationen; Forschungsbeiträge zur Stadt- und Regionalgeographie, Band 1. Münster.
- Parrad, F. (2005): Usages et pratiques de la prospective territoriale dans les grandes villes européennes. In: *Territoires 2030*, N.1, 103–117.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/bib_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 10.04.2006).
- Petzold, W. (2006): Die Reform der EU-Strukturpolitik 2007–2013 zwischen Verteilungslogik und Europäisierung. In: *Europäisches Zentrum für Föderalismus-Forschung* (Hrsg.): *Jahrbuch des Föderalismus 2006. Föderalismus, Subsidiarität und Regionen Europas*, 552–571. Baden-Baden.
- Pfeiffer, J.; Schmiedel, C. (2005): Gemeinsamer Antrag der CDU-Fraktion und der SPD-Fraktion beim Verband Region Stuttgart zur Einbringung in der 10. Sitzung des Regionalparlamentes am 07.12.2005, Strategiekonzept; unv.
- Pfister, E. (2007): Europäischer Verflechtungsraum Bodensee; Antwortschreiben an die Regionalverbände Bodensee-Oberschwaben und Hochrhein-Bodensee vom 05.03.2007; unv.
- Pföhler, W. (2005): Vorwort. In: *Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar: Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22.02.2005 in Mannheim*.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf, 1 (Abruf: 31.07.2008).
- Preising, T. (2008): Metropolregionen – ein fragender Blick. Potenziale und Perspektiven für die räumliche Planung. In: *Planerin* 1/08, 36–37.
- Priebs, A. (2006): Regionalverbände: Starke Partner für die Zukunftsgestaltung in Ballungsräumen. In: *Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Regionalverbände in Ballungsräumen und dem Regionalverband Ruhr* (Hrsg.): *Starke Partner für die Zukunftsgestaltung in Ballungsräumen*, 5–7.
- Priebs, A. (2005): Stadt-Umland-Problematik. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): *Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung*, 1096–1103. Hannover.
- Priebs, A. (2003): Erster Regionsrat der Region Hannover. In: *Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Landtag NRW* (Hrsg.): *Fundament für die Metropolregion Ruhrgebiet schaffen – Dokumentation der Veranstaltung vom 06. 12.2002*, 27–39. Düsseldorf.
- Priebs, A. (2002): Die Stadtregion der Zukunft zwischen informellen Netzwerken und verbindlichen Entscheidungsstrukturen.
URL: <http://www.newsletter.stadt2030.de/index7.htm> (Abruf: 21.05.2008).
- Prognos (2007): *Zukunftsatlas 2007*.
URL: http://www.prognos.com/zukunftsatlas/p_zukunftsatlas_karten_07.html (Abruf: 27.11.2007).
- Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar (2005): *Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Fakten und Hintergründe*.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_broschuere_hintergruende_d671f93.pdf (Abruf: 15.12.2005).
- Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar (2005a): *Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22.02.2005 in Mannheim*.

- URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf (Abruf: 15.12.2005).
- Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben (2007): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland – Beschluss; unv.
- Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben (2007a): Bewerbung als Modellvorhaben „Europäischer Verflechtungsraum Bodensee“; unv.
- Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben (2006): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland – Einstimmiger Beschluss zu Top 5; unv.
- Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben (Hrsg.) (2005): Rankings und Online-Erhebungen. Die Region Bodensee-Oberschwaben im bundesweiten Vergleich; Infoheft Nr. 7. Ravensburg.
- Regionalverband Bodensee-Oberschwaben; Regionalverband Hochrhein-Bodensee (2006): Vorschlag zum weiteren Vorgehen „Europäischer Verflechtungsraum Bodensee“; unv.
- Regionalverband Heilbronn-Franken (Hrsg.) (2006): Regionalplan Heilbronn-Franken 2006. Heilbronn.
- Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2007): Regionalplan Neckar-Alb 2007 Planentwurf; unv.
- Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2006): Weiterentwicklung der Kooperation in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart. RV-Drucksache Nr. VII–18/1.
URL: http://www.regionalverband-neckar-alb.de/drucksachen/rv-ds_7-18-1.htm (Abruf: 12.04.2006)
- Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2005): Die Regionen Stuttgart und Neckar-Alb – starke Partner in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart. RV-Drucksache Nr. VII–18.
URL: http://www.regionalverband-neckar-alb.de/drucksachen/rv-ds_7-18.htm (Abruf: 12.04.2006)
- Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2004): Modellprojekt Regionaler Gewerbeflächenpool Neckar-Alb – Abschlussbericht. Mössingen.
- Regionalverband Neckar-Alb (2003): Weiterentwicklung der Kooperation in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart. RV-Drucksache Nr. VI–68.
URL: http://www.regionalverband-neckar-alb.de/drucksachen/rv-ds_6-68.htm (Abruf: 11.04.2006).
- Regionalverband Südlicher Oberrhein (2004): Regionales Arbeitsprogramm 2005–2009 (7. Wahlperiode); unv.
- Reimer, W. (2007): Zukunft der ländlichen Räume im „Metropolenfieber“. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Reimer, W. (2006): Metropolregionen und Lissabon-Strategie – Herausforderungen für ländliche Räume. In: Agrarsoziale Gesellschaft e. V. (Hrsg.): Ländliche Räume zwischen Lissabon-Strategie und Metropolregionen, 14–21. Göttingen.
- Reiss-Schmidt, S. (2003): Herausforderungen und Chancen kooperativer Regionalentwicklung. Perspektiven für die Region München. In: DISP 152/2003, 71–79.
- Richter, M. (2006): Quo vadis Regionalpolitik? Die neuen Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung aus Sicht der regionalen Strukturpolitik. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 665–669.
- Ritter, E. (2005): Europäische Planungsverfahren. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 241–246. Hannover.
- Ritter, E. (2002): Raumplanung wohin – zur Neugestaltung eines Politikfeldes. Sechs Bemerkungen zur Positionierung von Raumplanung als Handlungsfeld der Zukunftsgestaltung. In: ARL (Hrsg.): Raumplanung hat Zukunft. Räumliche Planung im Spannungsfeld von Europäisierung und Regionalisierung, 14–19. Hannover.
- Rooks, P. (2006): Zukunftschancen nutzen – Beitrag der Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung für ein neues Selbstverständnis der Regionen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 637–643.
- Rozenblat, C.; Cicille, P. (2004): Die Städte Europas. Eine vergleichende Analyse. Forschungen des BBR, 115. Bonn.
- Rumley, P. (2006): Mit Leitbildern zu mehr Nachhaltigkeit? In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung 6/2006, o. S.
- Sassen, S. (1996): Metropolen des Weltmarkts. Die neue Rolle der Global Cities. Frankfurt/New York
- Scheller, J. (2002): Kooperations- und Organisationsformen für Stadtregionen – Modelle und ihre Umsetzungschancen. In: Mayr, A.; Meurer, M.; Vogt, J. (Hrsg.) (2002): Stadt und Region. Dynamik von Lebenswelten. Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen. 53. Deutscher Geographentag Leipzig, 692–700. Leipzig.
- Schlich, D. (2008): Metropolen und Metropolregionen. Einige grundsätzliche Gedanken. In: PlanerIn 1/08, 5–7.

- Schuster, W. (2006): Europäische Metropolregionen am Beispiel der Region Stuttgart: Strategisches Bündnis für die Zukunft. In: Europa kommunal 3/2006, 108–110.
- Schuster, W. (2006a): Partnerschaft für die Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart Oktober 2006; unv.
- Scott, J. (2005): Grenzüberschreitende Raumordnung. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 408–414. Hannover.
- Sinz, M. (2007a): Metropolregionen, ländliche Wachstumspole und Stabilisierungsräume in den neuen Leitbildern der Raumentwicklung. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 22–35. Hannover.
- Sinz, M. (2006): Die neuen Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung – Anmerkungen zu einem politischen Diskurs. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 605–612.
- Sinz, M. (2005): Raumordnung/Raumordnungspolitik. In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (ARL) (Hrsg.) (2005): Handwörterbuch der Raumordnung, 863–872. Hannover.
- Sinz, M. (2005a): Metropolregionen. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung, Nr. 7.2005, I–IV.
- Sonnleitner, G. (2007): Aufgaben und Chancen für die deutsche Landwirtschaft und den ländlichen Raum im 21. Jahrhundert. In: Ländlicher Raum, Nr. 05/05, 42–44.
- Spannowsky, W. et al (2004): Strategische und strukturelle Weiterentwicklung der Zusammenarbeit in der Region Rhein-Neckar, unv. Gutachten.
- Specht, C. (2005): Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zu europäischen Metropolregion – Modellregion für kooperativen Föderalismus und Regional Governance. In: Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar: Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22. 02.2005 in Mannheim.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf, 16.
- Staats, J.-U. (2006): Die neuen Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung – Möglichkeiten zur Umsetzung durch die Bundesraumordnung. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 11/12.2006, 693–700.
- Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg (2007): Trends und Fakten. Regionales Wirtschaftswachstum in Baden-Württemberg. Stuttgart.
- Stabsabteilung Kommunikation der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart (2007): Stuttgart Pressedienst „Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart: Lenkungskreis beschließt Eckpunkte für Koordinierungsausschuss“ vom 23.04.2007.
- Stabsstelle des Oberbürgermeisters (2006): Protokoll. Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart; „Lenkungskreis“ Freitag, 17.03.2006; unv.
- Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg (2005): Perspektiven der Globalisierung für Baden-Württemberg. Chancen einer Wissenswirtschaft. Stuttgart.
- Steinacher, B. (2007): Aktivitäten und Vernetzung der Metropolregionen in Deutschland und Europa. Tagungsskript der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Steinacher, B. (2006): Eine Strategie für die Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart.
URL: http://www.forum-region-stuttgart.de/reden/2006/Steinacher12_%2010_%2006.pdf (Abruf: 31.07.2008).
- Steinacher, B. (2003): Strategien für eine erfolgreiche Internationalisierung am Beispiel der Region Stuttgart. Impulsreferat auf der Tagung „Internationalisierungskonzept“ der Metropolregion Hamburg im September 2003.
URL: <http://www.metropolregion.hamburg.de/artikel.do?cid=3914410>.
- Steinacher, B. (2002): Handlungspotenziale in den Metropolregionen. Thesen und Beispiele aus der Region Stuttgart. In: Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 6/7 2002, 377–380.
- Steinacher, B. (2001): Handlungspotentiale in den Metropolregionen – Thesen und Beispiele aus der Region Stuttgart. In: Kujath, H.; von Schlippenbach, U. (Hrsg.): Europäische Verflechtungen deutscher Metropolregionen als Herausforderung für Politik und Wirtschaft, Tagungsbericht zur Fachkonferenz am 13.12.2001 in Frankfurt am Main, 73–76. Frankfurt.
- Steinberg, E. (2003): Innovation durch Kooperation. Der Wirtschaftsraum Südbayern, MAI. In: DISP 152/2003, 102–107.
- Stiens, G. (2003): Szenarien zur Raumentwicklung. Raum- und Siedlungsstrukturen Deutschlands 2015/2040; Forschungen des BBR, 112. Bonn.
- Stöhr, B. (2006): Ergebnisprotokoll der Sitzung der Lenkungsgruppe Region Neckar-Alb in der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart am 10.03.2006; unv.

- Stürmer (2006): Angaben zu vorhandenen und geplanten Strukturen der Metropolregionen (Kurzfassung); unv.
- Technische Universität Berlin Fakultät VII – Architektur Umwelt Gesellschaft (2003): Modellvorhaben Regionen der Zukunft. Initiativkreis Metropolregionen in Deutschland, Strategiepapier; unv.
- Thierstein, A. et al (2006): Raumentwicklung im Verborgenen. Die Entwicklung der Metropolregion Nordschweiz. Zürich.
- Thierstein, A. et al (2003): Zu gross, um wahr zu sein? Die Europäische Metropolregion Zürich. In: DISP 152, 87–94.
- Touche, A. (Hrsg.) (2006): État des lieux de 8 coopérations dans 7 métropoles.
URL: http://www.diact.gouv.fr/datar_site/datar_framedef.nsf/webmaster/dossiers_framedef_vf?OpenDocument (Abruf: 21.02.2007).
- Touche, A. (Hrsg.) (2006a): État des lieux de 8 coopérations dans 7 métropoles. Évaluation de l'appel à coopération métropolitaine. Dispositif d'accompagnement national. Paris.
- Touche, A. (2006b): E-Mail bezüglich Coopération métropolitaine vom 24.02.2006; unv.
- Vallée, D. (2003): Verband Region Stuttgart. In: Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Landtag NRW (Hrsg.): Fundament für die Metropolregion Ruhrgebiet schaffen – Dokumentation der Veranstaltung vom 6.12.2002, 6–17. Düsseldorf
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2008): Entwurf des Regionalplans 2020.
URL: http://www.region-stuttgart.org/vrsuploads/080130_Textentwurf_Regionalplan.pdf (Abruf: 25.07.2008).
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2007): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart – Entwurf eines gemeinsamen Regionalentwicklungskonzeptes, Aktualisierung vom 18.05.2007; unv.
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2007a): Vorschlag eines Koordinierungsausschusses Europäische Metropolregion beim Verband Region Stuttgart; Schreiben vom 24.04.2007; unv.
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2006): Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart – Entwurf eines gemeinsamen Regionalentwicklungskonzeptes; unv.
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2006a): Sitzungsvorlage Nr. 50/2006 zur Regionalversammlung am 12.04.2006; unv.
- VRS (Verband Region Stuttgart) (2005): Niederschrift über die gemeinsame Sitzung der Ältestenräte der Regionen Heilbronn-Franken, Neckar-Alb, Nordschwarzwald, Ostwürttemberg und Stuttgart am 12.12.2005 in Stuttgart; unv.
- Verband Region Stuttgart (VRS) (2003): Strategiepapier zur Weiterentwicklung der Kooperation der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart.
URL: <http://www.region-stuttgart.org/vrsuploads/WIV17303A001.pdf> (Abruf: 31.07.2008).
- Voscherau, E. (2005): Key-note zur Metropolregion. In: Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar: Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22. 02.2005 in Mannheim.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf, 11.
- Weiß, U. (2003): Machbarkeitsstudien für regionale Projekte. In: Raumforschung und Raumordnung, 1/2/2003, 13–27.
- Wendel, J. (2004): La mutation des emplois hautement qualifiés dans l'agglomération transfrontalière strasbourgeoise. In: Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français 4/2004, 596–620.
- Wilkes, M. (2005): Statement zur regionalen Verantwortung für die Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. In: Raumordnungsverband Rhein-Neckar: Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar. Das Rhein-Neckar-Dreieck auf dem Weg zur Europäischen Metropolregion – Symposium am 22.02.2005 in Mannheim.
URL: http://www.rhein-neckar-dreieck.de/uploads/tx_basfzmrnfilelist/rov_dokumentation_d671f93.pdf, 14.
- Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg (2006): Jahreswirtschaftsbericht 2005/2006.
URL: http://www.newcome.de/existenzgruendung/News/JWB2005_2006.pdf?PHPSESSID=4d740ee (Abruf: 01.08.2006).
- Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg (2005): Staatsvertrag zwischen den Ländern Baden-Württemberg, Hessen und Rheinland-Pfalz über die Zusammenarbeit bei der Raumordnung und Weiterentwicklung im Rhein-Neckar-Gebiet; Schreiben vom 07.06.2005; unv.
- Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg (2002): Landesentwicklungsplan Baden-Württemberg. Stuttgart.

- Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg (o.J.): Entwurf des Gesetzes zur Änderung des Landesplanungsgesetzes und des Gesetzes über die Errichtung des Verbands Region Stuttgart.
- Wolfram, M. (2004): La production des « catalyseurs métropolitains »: L'exemple de la transformation des politiques urbaines à Stuttgart. In: Jouve, B.; Lefèvre, C. (Hrsg.): Horizons métropolitains, 71–112. Lausanne.
- Zieger, J. et al (2007): Schreiben an Oberbürgermeister Schuster vom 19.04.2007; unv.
- Zimmermann, H. (2007): Die Rolle „mittlerer“ Regionen aus ökonomischer Sicht: Regionen zwischen Agglomeration und ländlich-strukturschwachem Raum. In: Köhler, S. (Hrsg.): Wachstumsregionen fernab der Metropolen. Chancen, Potenziale und Strategien. Arbeitsmaterialien der ARL Nr. 334, 8–21. Hannover.
- Zimmermann-Steinhart, P. (2003): Europas erfolgreiche Regionen. Handlungsspielräume im innovativen Wettbewerb. Schriftenreihe des Europäischen Zentrums für Föderalismus-Forschung, Band 26. Baden-Baden.
- Zimmermann-Steinhart, P. (2001): Die Entstehung der Initiative „Vier Motoren für Europa“. In: Fischer, T.; Frech, S. (Hrsg.): Baden-Württemberg und seine Partnerregionen, 48–61. Stuttgart.

Mündliche Informationen

- Aring, J. (2007a): Professur Stadt- und Regionalplanung Universität Kassel; 28.06.2007 in Kassel
- Dallinger, S. (2006): Direktor Verband Rhein-Neckar; 17.11.2006 in Mannheim
- Eberle, G. (2006): Leiterin des Bürger- und Verkehrsvereins Tübingen; 11.04.2006 in Tübingen
- Eble, T. (2008): Verbandsdirektor Region Ostwürttemberg; 06.06.2008 in Schwäbisch Gmünd
- Edelmann, D. (2006): Bürgermeister Gemeinde Schlaitdorf; 24.11.2006 in Schlaitdorf
- Ewald, M. (2007): Bürgermeister Stadt Bad Urach; 12.01.2007 in Bad Urach
- Gust, D. (2007): Verbandsdirektor Region Neckar-Alb; 03.07.2007 in Mössingen
- Gust, D. (2006): Verbandsdirektor Region Neckar-Alb; 25.04.2006 in Mössingen
- Hein, E. (2007): Verbandsdirektor Region Heilbronn-Franken; 11.06.2007 in Tübingen
- Jessel, B. (2005): damals Professur Landschaftsplanung Universität Potsdam; 27.01.2005 in Tübingen
- Köhler, S. (2007c): Verbandsdirektor Region Bodensee-Oberschwaben; 17.10.2007 in Ravensburg
- Kühne, O. (2007): Ministerium für Umwelt des Saarlandes; 15.07.2007 in Hamburg
- Ludwig, J. (2006): Verband Region Stuttgart; 14.07.2006 in Stuttgart
- Mungenast, K. (2007): Bürgermeister von Kappelrodeck; 12.06.2007 in Kappelrodeck
- Riethe, M. (2008): Stellvertretender Verbandsdirektor Regionalverband Ostwürttemberg; 06.06.2008 in Schwäbisch Gmünd
- Rogg, W. (2007): Geschäftsführer der Wirtschaftsförderung Region Stuttgart; 16.05.2007 in Stuttgart
- Russ-Scherer, B. (2006): Oberbürgermeisterin Tübingen; 20.12.2006 in Tübingen
- Samain, M. (2007): Regionalverband Donau-Iller; 29.06.2007 in Nürtingen
- Scheffold, H. (2007): Ministerium Ländlicher Raum; 11.07.2007 in Stuttgart
- Schlossnickel, R. (2006): Stabsstelle des Oberbürgermeisters der Stadt Stuttgart; 30.06.2006 in Stuttgart
- Schmid, R. (2006): Forum Region Stuttgart; 14.07.2006 in Stuttgart
- Schuler, B. (2006): Oberbürgermeister von Leonberg; 12.08. in Leonberg
- Schulze, U. (2006): Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Württemberg; 12.05.2006 in Stuttgart (zeitweise beteiligt Herr Koch vom Referat 51)
- Sinz, M. (2007): Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung; 25.10.2007 in Berlin
- Steinacher, B. (2008): Verbandsdirektor Verband Region Stuttgart; 12.06.2008 in Stuttgart

Telefonate

- Deuschle, U. (2008): Mitglied der Regionalversammlung des VRS am 05.05.2008
 Hein, E. (2008): Regionaldirektor Regionalverband Heilbronn-Franken am 08.02.2008
 Kammerlander, R. (2006): Sprengelvorsitzender der Gemeinden im Altkreis Kirchheim am 14.11. 2006
 Kleemann, H.-P. (2008): Mitglied der Regionalversammlung des VRS am 24. 04.2008
 Schlossnickel, R. (2008): Stabsstelle des Oberbürgermeisters der Stadt Stuttgart am 07.02.2008
 Schmid, R. (2007): Forum Region Stuttgart am 15.05.2007

Vortragsmitschriebe

- Aring, J. (2007a): Leitbilder und Handlungsstrategien für die Raumentwicklung in Deutschland. Vortrag gehalten im Rahmen der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik?“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Baumgartner, M. (2007): Das Entwicklungsprogramm Ländlicher Raum (ELR) – Vorstellung eines Programms zur Strukturentwicklung des ländlichen Raums. Vortrag gehalten auf dem Hochschultag ländlicher Raum am 10.05.2007 in Stuttgart.
- Baumheier, R. (2007): Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion – wie funktionieren großräumige Verantwortungsgemeinschaften. Einführung zur Podiumsdiskussion auf der Wissenschaftlichen Plenarsitzung der ARL „Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion“ am 15.06.2007 in Hamburg.
- Grabski-Kieron, U. (2007): Entwicklung ländlicher Räume in Deutschland und der EU unter veränderten strukturpolitischen Rahmenbedingungen – Perspektiven für Planung und angewandte Forschung. Vortrag gehalten auf dem Hochschultag ländlicher Raum am 10.05.2007 in Stuttgart.
- Hager, G. (2007): Stand der Arbeiten am Europäischen Verflechtungsraum Oberrhein. Vortrag gehalten im Institut für Städtebau und Landschaftsplanung am 10.07.2007 in Karlsruhe.
- Hauk, P. (2007a): Ländliche Räume: Wachstumsmotoren in Baden-Württemberg. Vortrag gehalten im Rahmen der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik?“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Kaufmann, R. (2007a): Möglichkeiten der Regionalpolitik. Vortrag gehalten im Rahmen der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik?“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Klemm, G. (2007): Einführung zur Wissenschaftlichen Plenarsitzung der ARL „Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion“ am 14.06.2007 in Hamburg.
- Lütke Daldrup, E. (2007): Leitbilder und Entwicklungsstrategien für die Metropolregionen in Deutschland. Vortrag auf der Wissenschaftlichen Plenarsitzung der ARL „Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion“ am 15.06.2007 in Hamburg.
- Lutter, H. (2007): Die Rolle der Metropolregionen in der Planung. Vortrag gehalten am zweiten Tag der Planung der Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Umwelt am 29.06.2007 in Nürtingen.
- Reimer, W. (2007a): Zukunft der ländlichen Räume im „Metropolienfieber“. Vortrag gehalten im Rahmen der Tagung „Metropolregionen versus Ländliche Räume: Ein Paradigmenwechsel in der Strukturpolitik?“ am 22.03.2007 in Königsfeld.
- Schuster, W. (2006b): Begrüßung und Einführung. Kommunalkonferenz Stuttgart. Kompetenzzentrum Europäische Metropolregion – neue Initiativen am 06.02.2006 in Stuttgart.
- Steinacher, B. (2007b): Metropolregionen – eine Erfolgsstory? Vortrag auf der Wissenschaftlichen Plenarsitzung der ARL „Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion“ am 14.06.2007 in Hamburg.
- Steinacher, B. (2004): Leitbild für die Region Stuttgart. Vortrag gehalten auf der Tagung Quo vadis Region Stuttgart 2020 am 11.11.2004 in Stuttgart.
- Vallée, D. (2007): Perspektiven der Metropolregion Stuttgart. Vortrag gehalten am zweiten Tag der Planung der Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Umwelt am 29.06.2007 in Nürtingen.
- Walcha, H. (2006): Begrüßung und Einführung. Kommunalkonferenz Stuttgart. Kompetenzzentrum Europäische Metropolregion – neue Initiativen am 06.02.2006 in Stuttgart.
- Wegelin, F. (2007): Metropolregionen in der Schweiz. Vortrag auf der Wissenschaftlichen Plenarsitzung der ARL „Metropolregionen und territoriale Kohäsion“ am 14.06.2007 in Hamburg.

Sitzungsmitschriebe

- Bopp, T. (2007): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 23.04.2007 in Stuttgart (Thomas Bopp ist Vorsitzender Regionalversammlung des VRS).
- Bosch, B. (2007): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 23.04.2007 in Stuttgart (Barbara Bosch ist Oberbürgermeister des Oberzentrums Reutlingen in der Region Neckar-Alb).
- Hein, E. (2006): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 26.09.2006 in Stuttgart (Dr. Ekkehard Hein ist Regionaldirektor des Regionalverbandes Heilbronn-Franken).
- Kück, J.. (2006): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 26.09.2006 in Stuttgart (Jens Kück ist Regionaldirektor des Regionalverbandes Nordschwarzwald).
- Schuster, W. (2007): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 23.04.2007 in Stuttgart (Dr. Wolfgang Schuster ist Oberbürgermeister der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart).
- Schuster, W. (2006): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 26.09.2006 in Stuttgart.
- Steinacher, B. (2007a): Lenkungskreis-Sitzung am 23.04.2007 in Stuttgart (Dr. Bernd Steinacher ist Regionaldirektor des VRS).

Appendix

Letter to mayors (example: Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region)

Questionnaire for the Metropolitan Region of Stuttgart

Questionnaire for the Regional Assembly of the Stuttgart Regional Association

Questionnaire for the Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region

Questionnaire for central places outside the accredited metropolitan regions

Questionnaire for the Strasbourg-Ortenau Eurodistrict

Letter to mayors (example: Rhine/Neckar Metropolitan Region)

Sehr geehrter Herr Bürgermeister,

seit April diesen Jahres ist die Region Rhein-Neckar von der Ministerkonferenz für Raumordnung als Europäische Metropolregion ausgewiesen. Damit erreicht sie dieselbe Stellung wie die bereits seit 1995 ausgewiesene Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart.

Für den Lehrstuhl für Angewandte Geographie der Universität Tübingen, der sich schwerpunktmäßig mit Fragen der Raum-, Regional- und Fachplanungen beschäftigt, stellt das raumordnerische Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregionen ein hochaktuelles Forschungsfeld dar.

Bislang liegen nahezu keine wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen vor, wie sich dieses Konzept in die Planungspraxis umsetzen lässt. Im Rahmen meiner Habilitation werde ich daher die konkreten Ausgestaltungs- und Umsetzungsmöglichkeiten untersuchen.

Die Erfahrungen und Erwartungen der Kommunen spielen bei der konkreten Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Europäischen Metropolregionen eine besonders wichtige Rolle. Daher möchte ich Sie bitten, sich eine Viertelstunde Zeit zu nehmen und den beiliegenden Fragebogen auszufüllen. Um den Arbeitsaufwand möglichst gering zu halten, können Sie diesen Fragebogen direkt am PC bearbeiten und als E-Mail-Anhang an mich zurücksenden. Selbstverständlich ist auch ein Ausdruck und die Rücksendung per Fax oder auf dem Postweg möglich.

Ich wäre Ihnen dankbar, wenn Sie mir den Fragebogen noch vor Weihnachten übersenden könnten. Sollten Sie nicht, oder nur in Teilbereichen für die Fragestellungen zuständig sein, so bitte ich Sie, den Fragebogen intern weiterzuleiten.

Nach Abschluss der Erhebungen werden die Ergebnisse der Arbeit veröffentlicht werden. Einen Hinweis auf die Veröffentlichungen werden Sie auf elektronischem Wege erhalten.

Ich danke Ihnen bereits heute sehr herzlich für Ihre Unterstützung.

Für Rückfragen stehe ich Ihnen gerne zur Verfügung (Kontaktdaten siehe unten).

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Heidi Megerle

Fragebogen zur Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart

Hinweise zum digitalen Ausfüllen des Fragebogens am PC:

1. Bei zutreffenden Aussagen markieren Sie bitte die Kontrollkästchen ☐ durch einfaches Anklicken mit der linken Maustaste;
2. Um eine Frage zu beantworten oder eine Aussagen zu machen, klicken Sie bitte auf das grau unterlegte Textfeld (wird bei längerem Text automatisch größer);

Gemeinde

Rücksendung am

Frage 1: Welche Erwartungen verbinden Sie mit dem Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart

Frage 2: Ist das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für Sie transparent und verständlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 3: Bislang gibt es für die Europäische Metropolregion Stuttgart keine gebiets-scharfe Abgrenzung. Sehen Sie Ihre Gemeinde als Bestandteil der Metropol-region?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 4: Halten Sie eine gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung für erforderlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 5: Im Moment wird eine sehr großräumige Abgrenzung diskutiert, die auch weite Bereiche des ländlichen Raumes einschließen würde. Wie stehen Sie zu einer solchen Abgrenzung?

| |
|--|
| Wir befürworten eine großräumige Abgrenzung, da: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ansonsten Gebiete ausgegrenzt werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ein größeres Gebiet auch vielfältigere Potentiale aufweist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |
| Wir befürworten eine Abgrenzung, die nur den Verdichtungsraum einschließt, da |
| <input type="checkbox"/> der Einschluss des ländlichen Raumes der Grundkonzeption widerspricht |
| <input type="checkbox"/> der Kommunikations- und Kooperationsaufwand überschaubar bleibt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |

Frage 6: Könnten Sie sich auch eine Netzwerkstruktur vorstellen mit projekt- und themenorientierter Zusammenarbeit ohne gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 7: Wer sollte Ihrer Meinung nach für die Umsetzung und Steuerung der Metropolregion zuständig sein?

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Verband Region Stuttgart | <input type="checkbox"/> Oberbürgermeister Schuster/Stuttgart |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forum Region Stuttgart | <input type="checkbox"/> Institution auf Landesebene |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Institution/Gremium – bitte benennen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hierfür müsste ein eigenständiges neues Gremium geschaffen werden | |
| Falls ein neues Gremium geschaffen werden würde: | |
| Wo sollte dieses Gremium angesiedelt werden? | |
| Welche Zuständigkeitsbereiche und welche Kompetenzen sollte es haben? | |
| Wie sollte es aufgebaut sein (Personalstruktur etc)? | |
| Welche demokratische Legitimierung sollte das Gremium haben? | |
| Sollte oder müsste hierfür eine andere Planungsebene aufgelöst werden? | |

Frage 8: Sehen Sie weitere Akteure, die bei der Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Europäischen Metropolregion eine wesentliche Rolle spielen sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte Akteure und Aufgabenbereich benennen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 9: Die Europäischen Metropolregionen sollen als Wachstumsmotoren zur Leistungsfähigkeit Deutschlands beitragen und sich auf internationaler Ebene positionieren. Wie können Sie sich eine konkrete Umsetzung des Konzeptes vorstellen?

- ☐ Es müsste ein übergreifendes Leitbild/Gesamtkonzept erarbeitet werden
- ☐ Die Umsetzung sollte exemplarisch durch „Leuchtturm-Projekte“ erfolgen
- ☐ Sonstige Umsetzungsstrategien – bitte benennen:

Frage 10: Können die Ziele, die mit der Ausweisung der Europäischen Metropolregion verknüpft werden, Ihrer Meinung nach auch mit den bisherigen Konzepten der Raumordnung erreicht werden?

- ☐ Ja Begründung:
- ☐ Nein Begründung:

Frage 11: Wie sehen Sie die Rolle der Kommunen im Rahmen der Europäischen Metropolregion?

Könnten Sie sich eine Einschränkung der kommunalen Planungshoheit zugunsten einer metropolitanen Ebene vorstellen?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
- ☐ Nein Begründung

Frage 12: Wie könnte eine Finanzierung der Europäischen Metropolregion erfolgen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

- ☐ Förderprogramm der Europäischen Union ☐ Förderprogramm des Bundes
- ☐ Förderprogramm des Landes Baden-Württemberg
- ☐ Umlagefinanzierung der Gemeinden und sonstiger Institutionen
- ☐ Projektorientierte Finanzierung (Finanzierung durch beteiligte Akteure)
- ☐ Sonstiges – bitte benennen

Halten Sie eine Unterstützung der Wachstumsmotoren generell für gerechtfertigt?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
- ☐ Nein Begründung

Haben Sie Bedenken, dass eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Metropolregionen zur Verknappung der Mittel an anderer Stelle führen könnte?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
- ☐ Nein Begründung

Frage 13: Wie schätzen Sie die folgenden Fragestellungen ein? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|--|
| Wir fühlen uns als Kommune ausreichend über das Konzept der Metropolregion informiert |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Wir würden gerne verstärkt in den Umsetzungsprozess integriert werden |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Für unsere Kommune sehen wir überwiegend Vorteile durch die Europäische Metropolregion |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion stellt das raumordnerische Postulat der Herstellung gleichwertiger Lebensverhältnisse in Frage |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |

Frage 14: Wie schätzen Sie die Auswirkungen der Europäischen Metropolregion auf Gebiete ein, die außerhalb der Metropolregion liegen?

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv, v. a. aufgrund der Ausstrahlungseffekte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ; die räumlichen Disparitäten werden sich verstärken |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen |

Frage 15: Wie geeignet halten Sie das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für die im Folgenden angeführten Themenfelder? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|--|
| Anregung des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Beschleunigung der europäischen Integration |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Förderung von Natur- und Umweltschutz |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Bewältigung der Konsequenzen des demographischen Wandels |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Den Auswirkungen der Globalisierung erfolgreich zu begegnen |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Vermehrte Integration der Bevölkerung in den Prozess der Planungspraxis |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Intensivierung der Kooperation zwischen den verschiedenen Planungsebenen (Kommune, Region, Land) |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |

Haben Sie weitere Anregungen?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Ganz herzlichen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit
Bei Rückfragen und zur Rücksendung des Fragebogens:

Dr. Heidi Megerle
Geographisches Institut der Universität Tübingen
Rümelinstraße 19-23
72070 Tübingen
Tel.: 07071-2976095
Mail: heidi.megerle@uni-tuebingen.de

Fragebogen zur Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart

Hinweise zum digitalen Ausfüllen des Fragebogens am PC:

1. Bei zutreffenden Aussagen markieren Sie bitte die Kontrollkästchen ☐ durch einfaches Anklicken mit der linken Maustaste;
2. Um eine Frage zu beantworten oder eine Aussagen zu machen, klicken Sie bitte auf das grau unterlegte Textfeld (wird bei längerem Text automatisch größer);

Name _____ Rücksendung am _____
(Auf Wunsch können Ihre Daten gerne anonymisiert werden)

Frage 1: Welche Erwartungen verbinden Sie mit dem Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion Stuttgart

Frage 2: Fühlen Sie sich ausreichend über das Konzept der Metropolregion informiert?

| | |
|---|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |
| Wenn Nein, welche weiteren Informationen wären für Sie von Bedeutung? | |
| Von welcher Institution hätten Sie sich diese Informationen erwartet? | |

Frage 3: Welche Gebietskulisse halten Sie für die Metropolregion Stuttgart für angemessen?

| |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Verdichtungsraum Stuttgart und Randzone (nach Landesentwicklungsplan 2002) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> nur Verdichtungsraum Stuttgart ohne Randzone |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gebiet des Verbands Region Stuttgart (d.h. inklusive ländliche Räume) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gebiet der Regionalverbände Stuttgart, Neckar-Alb, Nordschwarzwald, Heilbronn-Franken und Ostwürttemberg |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Abgrenzung Begründung: |

Frage 4: Halten Sie eine gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung überhaupt für erforderlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 5: Könnten Sie sich auch eine Netzwerkstruktur vorstellen mit projekt- und themenorientierter Zusammenarbeit ohne gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 6: Die aktuelle großräumige Abgrenzung schließt auch weite Bereiche des ländlichen Raumes ein. Wie stehen Sie zu einer solchen Abgrenzung?

| |
|--|
| Ich befürworte eine großräumige Abgrenzung, da: <input type="checkbox"/> ansonsten Gebiete ausgegrenzt werden <input type="checkbox"/> ein größeres Gebiet auch vielfältigere Potentiale aufweist <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |
| Ich befürworte eine Abgrenzung, die nur den Verdichtungsraum einschließt, da <input type="checkbox"/> der Einschluss des ländlichen Raumes der Grundkonzeption widerspricht <input type="checkbox"/> der Kommunikations- und Kooperationsaufwand überschaubar bleibt <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |

Frage 7: Wie schätzen Sie generell die Auswirkungen der Europäischen Metropolregion auf Gebiete ein, die außerhalb der gewählten Gebietskulisse liegen?

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv; v. a. aufgrund der Ausstrahlungseffekte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ; die räumlichen Disparitäten werden sich verstärken |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen |

Frage 8: Wer sollte Ihrer Meinung nach für die Umsetzung und Steuerung der Metropolregion zuständig sein?

| |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Für die Steuerung der Metropolregion ist eine konkrete Institution mit entsprechenden Zuständigkeiten und Kompetenzen erforderlich (bitte weiter bei 8b) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Projektbezogene Netzwerkpartnerschaften reichen aus; eine konkrete Institution ist nicht erforderlich (bitte weiter bei Frage 10) |

Frage 8b:

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Verband Region Stuttgart <input type="checkbox"/> Forum Region Stuttgart <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Institution/Gremium – bitte benennen <input type="checkbox"/> Hierfür müsste ein eigenständiges neues Gremium geschaffen werden Falls ein neues Gremium geschaffen werden würde: Wo sollte dieses Gremium angesiedelt werden? Welche Zuständigkeitsbereiche und welche Kompetenzen sollte es haben? Wie sollte es aufgebaut sein (Personalstruktur etc)? Welche demokratische Legitimierung sollte das Gremium haben? Sollte oder müsste hierfür eine andere Planungsebene aufgelöst werden? | <input type="checkbox"/> Oberbürgermeister Schuster/Stuttgart <input type="checkbox"/> Institution auf Landesebene |
|---|---|

Frage 9: Zusammenarbeit mit den angrenzenden Regionalverbänden

| |
|---|
| Wie werten Sie die Zusammenarbeit mit den angrenzenden Regionalverbänden? |
| Wie schätzen Sie den neu geschaffenen Koordinierungsausschuss ein? |
| Wer sollte die Metropolregion auf nationaler und internationaler Ebene vertreten? |

Frage 10: Sehen Sie weitere Akteure, die bei der Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Europäischen Metropolregion eine wesentliche Rolle spielen sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte Akteure und Aufgabenbereich benennen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 11: Die Europäischen Metropolregionen sollen als Wachstumsmotoren zur Leistungsfähigkeit Deutschlands beitragen und sich auf internationaler Ebene positionieren. Wie können Sie sich eine konkrete Umsetzung des Konzeptes vorstellen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Es müsste ein übergreifendes Leitbild/Gesamtkonzept erarbeitet werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Die Umsetzung sollte exemplarisch durch „Leuchtturm-Projekte“ erfolgen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Umsetzungsstrategien – bitte benennen: |
| In welchen Bereichen sehen Sie in der Metropolregion Stuttgart Handlungsbedarf? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wirtschaftsförderung <input type="checkbox"/> Forschung und Entwicklung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Erhöhung internationaler Bekanntheitsgrad <input type="checkbox"/> Aufbau Regionalbewusstsein |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vernetzung innerhalb der Region <input type="checkbox"/> Vernetzung außerhalb der Region |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |

Frage 12: Wie könnte eine Finanzierung der Europäischen Metropolregion erfolgen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm der Europäischen Union | <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Bundes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Landes Baden-Württemberg | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Umlagefinanzierung der Gemeinden und sonstiger Institutionen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Projektorientierte Finanzierung (Finanzierung durch beteiligte Akteure) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen | |
| Halten Sie eine Unterstützung der Wachstumsmotoren generell für gerechtfertigt? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |
| Haben Sie Bedenken, dass eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Metropolregionen zur Verknappung der Mittel an anderer Stelle führen könnte? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |

Frage 13: Wie geeignet halten Sie das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für die im Folgenden angeführten Themenfelder? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|---|
| Anregung des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Beschleunigung der europäischen Integration |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Förderung von Natur- und Umweltschutz |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bewältigung der Konsequenzen des demographischen Wandels |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Den Auswirkungen der Globalisierung erfolgreich zu begegnen |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Vermehrte Integration der Bevölkerung in den Prozess der Planungspraxis |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Intensivierung der Kooperation zwischen den verschiedenen Planungsebenen (Kommune, Region, Land) |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |

Haben Sie weitere Anregungen?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Ganz herzlichen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit
Bei Rückfragen und zur Rücksendung des Fragebogens:

Dr. Heidi Megerle
Geographisches Institut der Universität Tübingen
Rümelinstraße 19-23
72070 Tübingen
Tel.: 07071-2976095
Mail: heidi.megerle@uni-tuebingen.de

Fragebogen zur Europäischen Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar

Hinweise zum digitalen Ausfüllen des Fragebogens am PC:

1. Bei zutreffenden Aussagen markieren Sie bitte die Kontrollkästchen ☐ durch einfaches Anklicken mit der linken Maustaste;
2. Um eine Frage zu beantworten oder eine Aussagen zu machen, klicken Sie bitte auf das grau unterlegte Textfeld (wird bei längerem Text automatisch größer);

Gemeinde Rücksendung am

Frage 1: Welche Erwartungen verbinden Sie mit dem Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Frage 2: Ist das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für Sie transparent und verständlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 3: Im Gegensatz zu anderen Metropolregionen wurde für die Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar eine gemeindescharfe Abgrenzung gewählt. Halten Sie dies für einen passenden Ansatz?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 4: Gibt es Ihrer Meinung nach Kommunen oder Gebiete, die noch in die Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar integriert werden sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte benennen: Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 5: Gibt es Ihrer Meinung nach Kommunen oder Gebiete, die sich zwar innerhalb der Abgrenzung der Metropolregion befinden, deren Aufnahme in die Metropolregion Sie jedoch nicht nachvollziehen können?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte benennen: Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 6: Könnten Sie sich auch eine Netzwerkstruktur vorstellen mit projekt- und themenorientierter Zusammenarbeit ohne gemeindescharfe Abgrenzung?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 7: Zur Entwicklungssteuerung wurde eine neue Organisationsstruktur geschaffen, bei der der Verband Region Rhein-Neckar, der Zukunft Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar e. V. und die IHKen sowie die Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar GmbH kooperieren. Halten Sie dies für eine gute Strategie?

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte begründen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Bitte begründen: |

Frage 8: Sehen Sie weitere Akteure, die bei der Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Europäischen Metropolregion eine wesentliche Rolle spielen sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte Akteure und Aufgabenbereich benennen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Bitte begründen: |

Frage 9: Die Europäischen Metropolregion Rhein-Neckar erstreckt sich auf drei Bundesländer. Sehen Sie hierin eher eine Chance oder ein Handicap?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chance | Bitte begründen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Handicap | Bitte begründen: |

Frage 10: Die Europäischen Metropolregionen sollen als Wachstumsmotoren zur Leistungsfähigkeit Deutschlands beitragen und sich auf internationaler Ebene positionieren. Wie können Sie sich eine konkrete Umsetzung des Konzeptes vorstellen?

| |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Es müsste ein übergreifendes Leitbild/Gesamtkonzept erarbeitet werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Die Umsetzung sollte exemplarisch durch „Leuchtturm-Projekte“ erfolgen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Weitere Umsetzungsstrategien – bitte benennen: |

Frage 11: Können die Ziele, die mit der Ausweisung der Europäischen Metropolregion verknüpft werden, Ihrer Meinung nach auch mit den bisherigen Konzepten der Raumordnung erreicht werden?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 12: Wie sehen Sie die Rolle der Kommunen im Rahmen der Europäischen Metropolregion?

Könnten Sie sich eine Einschränkung der kommunalen Planungshoheit zugunsten einer metropolitanen Ebene vorstellen?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
☐ Nein Begründung

Frage 13: Wie könnte eine Finanzierung der Europäischen Metropolregion erfolgen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm der Europäischen Union | <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Bundes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Landes Baden-Württemberg | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Umlagefinanzierung der Gemeinden und sonstiger Institutionen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Projektorientierte Finanzierung (Finanzierung durch beteiligte Akteure) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen | |
| Halten Sie eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Wachstumsmotoren generell für gerechtfertigt? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |
| Haben Sie Bedenken, dass eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Metropolregionen zur Verknappung der Mittel an anderer Stelle führen könnte? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |

Frage 14: Wie schätzen Sie die folgenden Fragestellungen ein? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|--|
| Wir fühlen uns als Kommune ausreichend über das Konzept der Metropolregion informiert |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Wir würden gerne verstärkt in den Umsetzungsprozess integriert werden |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Für unsere Kommune sehen wir überwiegend Vorteile durch die Europäische Metropolregion |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |
| Das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion stellt das raumordnerische Postulat der Herstellung gleichwertiger Lebensverhältnisse in Frage |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges |

Frage 15: Wie schätzen Sie die Auswirkungen der Europäischen Metropolregion auf Gebiete ein, die außerhalb der Metropolregion liegen?

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv, v. a. aufgrund der Ausstrahlungseffekte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ; die räumlichen Disparitäten werden sich verstärken |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen |

Frage 16: Wie geeignet halten Sie das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für die im Folgenden angeführten Themenfelder? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| | |
|--|---|
| Anregung des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Beschleunigung der europäischen Integration | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Förderung von Natur- und Umweltschutz | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bewältigung der Konsequenzen des demographischen Wandels | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Den Auswirkungen der Globalisierung erfolgreich zu begegnen | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Vermehrte Integration der Bevölkerung in den Prozess der Planungspraxis | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Intensivierung der Kooperation zwischen den verschiedenen Planungsebenen (Kommune, Region, Land) | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |

Haben Sie weitere Anregungen?

Ganz herzlichen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit
Bei Rückfragen und zur Rücksendung des Fragebogens:

Dr. Heidi Megerle
Geographisches Institut der Universität Tübingen
Rümelinstraße 19-23
72070 Tübingen
Tel.: 07071-2976095 Fax: 07071-295318 (bitte mit Namensangabe)
Mail: heidi.megerle@uni-tuebingen.de

Fragebogen zu Europäischen Metropolregionen in Baden-Württemberg

Hinweise zum digitalen Ausfüllen des Fragebogens am PC:

1. Bei zutreffenden Aussagen markieren Sie bitte die Kontrollkästchen ☐ durch einfaches Anklicken mit der linken Maustaste
2. Um eine Frage zu beantworten oder eine Aussagen zu machen, klicken Sie bitte auf das grau unterlegte Textfeld (wird bei längerem Text automatisch größer);

Gemeinde Rücksendung am

Frage 1: Sehen Sie Ihre Gemeinde als Bestandteil einer Metropolregion?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | und zwar in folgender Metropolregion: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Bitte beantworten Sie die weiteren Fragen auch dann, wenn Sie bei Frage 1 nein angekreuzt haben.

Frage 2: Ist das Konzept der Metropolregionen für Sie transparent und verständlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 3: Fühlen Sie sich ausreichend über das Konzept der Metropolregionen informiert?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Von welchen Stellen hätten Sie sich mehr Informationen erwartet?

Frage 4: Welche generellen Erwartungen verbinden Sie mit dem Konzept der Metropolregionen?

Frage 5: Die Europäischen Metropolregionen sollen als Wachstumsmotoren zur Leistungsfähigkeit Deutschlands beitragen und sich auf internationaler Ebene positionieren. Wie können Sie sich eine konkrete Umsetzung des Konzeptes vorstellen?

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Es müsste ein übergreifendes Leitbild/Gesamtkonzept erarbeitet werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Die Umsetzung sollte exemplarisch durch „Leuchtturm-Projekte“ erfolgen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sonstige Umsetzungsstrategien – bitte benennen: |

Frage 6: Können die Ziele, die mit der Ausweisung der Europäischen Metropolregion verknüpft werden, Ihrer Meinung nach auch mit den bisherigen Konzepten der Raumordnung erreicht werden?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 7: Sehen Sie im Konzept der Metropolregionen sowie in den neuen Leitbildern und Handlungsstrategien des Bundes, die im Sommer 2006 veröffentlicht wurden einen Paradigmenwechsel der Raumplanung?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 8: Wie schätzen Sie die Auswirkungen der Europäischen Metropolregion auf Gebiete ein, die außerhalb der Metropolregion liegen?

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv; v. a. aufgrund der Ausstrahlungseffekte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ; die räumlichen Disparitäten werden sich verstärken |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen |

Frage 9: Im Moment wird in einigen Fällen eine sehr großräumige Abgrenzung diskutiert, die auch weite Bereiche des ländlichen Raumes einschließen würde. Wie stehen Sie zu einer solchen Abgrenzung?

| |
|--|
| Wir befürworten eine großräumige Abgrenzung, da: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ansonsten Gebiete ausgegrenzt werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ein größeres Gebiet auch vielfältigere Potentiale aufweist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |
| Wir befürworten eine Abgrenzung, die nur den Verdichtungsraum einschließt, da |
| <input type="checkbox"/> der Einschluss des ländlichen Raumes der Grundkonzeption widerspricht |
| <input type="checkbox"/> der Kommunikations- und Kooperationsaufwand überschaubar bleibt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Gründe – bitte benennen: |

Frage 10: Halten Sie generell eine gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung für erforderlich?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 11: Halten Sie eine Netzwerkstruktur mit projekt- und themenorientierter Zusammenarbeit ohne gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung für besser?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 12: Wer sollte Ihrer Meinung nach für die Umsetzung und Steuerung der jeweiligen Metropolregionen zuständig sein?

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regionalplanung | <input type="checkbox"/> Oberbürgermeister der Kernstadt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Institution auf Landesebene | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Institution/Gremium – bitte benennen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hierfür müsste ein eigenständiges neues Gremium geschaffen werden | |
| Falls ein neues Gremium geschaffen werden würde: Wo sollte dieses Gremium angesiedelt werden? | |
| Welche Zuständigkeitsbereiche und welche Kompetenzen sollte es haben? | |
| Wie sollte es aufgebaut sein (Personalstruktur etc)? | |
| Welche demokratische Legitimierung sollte das Gremium haben? | |
| Sollte oder müsste hierfür eine andere Planungsebene aufgelöst werden? | |

Frage 13: Sehen Sie weitere Akteure, die bei der Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Europäischen Metropolregion eine wesentliche Rolle spielen sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte Akteure und Aufgabenbereich benennen: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 14: Wie sehen Sie die Rolle der Kommunen im Rahmen der Europäischen Metropolregion?

| | |
|--|------------|
| Könnten Sie sich eine Einschränkung der kommunalen Planungshoheit zugunsten einer metropolitanen Ebene vorstellen? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |

Frage 15: Wie könnte eine Finanzierung der Europäischen Metropolregionen erfolgen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm der Europäischen Union | <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Bundes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Förderprogramm des Landes Baden-Württemberg | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Umlagefinanzierung der Gemeinden und sonstiger Institutionen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Projektorientierte Finanzierung (Finanzierung durch beteiligte Akteure) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen | |
| Halten Sie eine Unterstützung der Wachstumsmotoren generell für gerechtfertigt? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |
| Haben Sie Bedenken, dass eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Metropolregionen zur Verknappung der Mittel an anderer Stelle führen könnte? | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung |

Frage 16: Wie geeignet halten Sie das Konzept der Europäischen Metropolregion für die im Folgenden angeführten Themenfelder? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| | |
|--|---|
| Anregung des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Beschleunigung der europäischen Integration | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Förderung von Natur- und Umweltschutz | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bewältigung der Konsequenzen des demographischen Wandels | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Den Auswirkungen der Globalisierung erfolgreich zu begegnen | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Vermehrte Integration der Bevölkerung in den Prozess der Planungspraxis | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Intensivierung der Kooperation zwischen den verschiedenen Planungsebenen (Kommune, Region, Land) | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |

Haben Sie weitere Anregungen?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Ganz herzlichen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit
Bei Rückfragen und zur Rücksendung des Fragebogens:

Dr. Heidi Megerle
Geographisches Institut der Universität Tübingen
Rümelinstraße 19-23
72070 Tübingen
Tel.: 07071-2976095
Fax: 07071-295318 (bitte unbedingt zu Händen von Frau Megerle)
Mail: heidi.megerle@uni-tuebingen.de

Fragebogen zum Eurodistrikt Strasbourg-Ortenau

Hinweise zum digitalen Ausfüllen des Fragebogens am PC:

1. Bei zutreffenden Aussagen markieren Sie bitte die Kontrollkästchen ☐ durch einfaches Anklicken mit der linken Maustaste;
2. Um eine Frage zu beantworten oder eine Aussagen zu machen, klicken Sie bitte auf das grau unterlegte Textfeld (wird bei längerem Text automatisch größer);

Gemeinde Rücksendung am

Frage 1: Welche generellen Erwartungen verbinden Sie mit dem Konzept des Euro-distriktes?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Frage 2: Die Anerkennung des Gebietes als erste transnationale Metropolregion wird auf deutscher Seite angestrebt; auf französischer Seite ist dies bereits erfolgt. Wie schätzen Sie diese Entwicklung ein?

| |
|--|
| Diese Anerkennung bringt weitere Vorteile, nämlich |
|--|

| |
|---|
| Diese Anerkennung bringt keine weiteren Vorteile, da: |
|---|

Frage 3: Die Metropolregionen bzw. Eurodistrikte sollen als Wachstumsmotoren zur Leistungsfähigkeit der Nationalstaaten sowie der Europäischen Union beitragen und sich auf internationaler Ebene positionieren. Wie können Sie sich eine konkrete Umsetzung des Konzeptes vorstellen?

- | |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Es müsste ein übergreifendes Leitbild/Gesamtkonzept erarbeitet werden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Die Umsetzung sollte exemplarisch durch „Leuchtturm-Projekte“ erfolgen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstige Umsetzungsstrategien – bitte benennen: |

Frage 4: Sehen Sie grundlegende Unterschiede zwischen den Konzepten des Euro-distriktes (transnational), der Metropolregionen (Deutschland) sowie der metropolitanen Kooperation (Frankreich)?

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Wenn ja, welche? |
|-----------------------------|------------------|

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |
|-------------------------------|-------------|

Frage 5: Sehen Sie in diesen Konzepten einen Paradigmenwechsel der Raumplanung?

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
|-----------------------------|-------------|

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |
|-------------------------------|-------------|

Frage 6: Wie schätzen Sie die Auswirkungen des Eurodistriktes auf Gebiete ein, die außerhalb liegen?

| |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv, v. a. aufgrund der Ausstrahlungseffekte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ; die räumlichen Disparitäten werden sich verstärken |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges – bitte benennen |

Frage 7: Im Gegensatz zu manchen Metropolregionen wurde für den Eurodistrikt eine gemeindegrenzscharfe Abgrenzung gewählt. Halten Sie dies für einen passenden Ansatz?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 8: Gibt es Ihrer Meinung nach Kommunen oder Gebiete, die noch in den Eurodistrikt integriert werden sollten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte benennen: Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 9: Gibt es Ihrer Meinung nach Kommunen oder Gebiete, die momentan Mitglieder des Eurodistriktes sind, bei denen Sie dies aber nicht für gerechtfertigt halten?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Bitte benennen: Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 10: Halten Sie eine Netzwerkstruktur mit projekt- und themenorientierter Zusammenarbeit ohne gebietsscharfe Abgrenzung für besser?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | Begründung: |

Frage 11: Wie sehen Sie die momentanen Überlegungen, die gesamte Oberrheinregion als Metropolregion einzustufen?

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positiv | Begründung: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negativ | Begründung: |

Frage 12: Wie sehen Sie die Rolle der einzelnen Kommunen im Rahmen des Euro-distriktes?

Könnten Sie sich eine Einschränkung der kommunalen Planungshoheit zugunsten einer metropolitanen Ebene vorstellen?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
☐ Nein Begründung

Frage 13: Die Umsetzung und Steuerung des Eurodistriktes erfolgt über den neugegründeten binationalen Eurodistriktrat + ergänzende Gremien. Halten Sie dies für eine gute Strategie?

☐ Ja Bitte begründen:

☐ Nein Bitte begründen:

Gibt es weitere Akteure, deren Integration Sie begrüßen würden?

☐ Ja Welche? Bitte benennen:

☐ Nein Bitte begründen:

Frage 14: Der Eurodistrikt umfasst Gebiete in zwei Nationalstaaten. Sehen Sie hierin eher eine Chance oder ein Handicap?

☐ Chance Bitte begründen:

☐ Handicap Bitte begründen:

Frage 15: Durch die beiden Nationalstaaten bestehen unterschiedliche Rahmenbedingungen in planungsrechtlicher, politischer und sprachlicher Hinsicht. Wie gehen Sie mit diesen Herausforderungen um?

Angewandte Strategien:

Frage 16: Wie könnte eine Finanzierung des Eurodistriktes erfolgen? (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)

- ☐ Förderprogramm der Europäischen Union ☐ Förderprogramm der Nationalstaaten
☐ Förderprogramm des Landes Baden-Württemberg bzw. der Région Alsace
☐ Umlagefinanzierung der Gemeinden und sonstiger Institutionen
☐ Projektorientierte Finanzierung (Finanzierung durch beteiligte Akteure)
☐ Sonstiges – bitte benennen

Halten Sie eine Unterstützung der Wachstumsmotoren generell für gerechtfertigt?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
☐ Nein Begründung

Haben Sie Bedenken, dass eine finanzielle Unterstützung der Metropolregionen zur Verknappung der Mittel an anderer Stelle führen könnte?

- ☐ Ja Begründung
☐ Nein Begründung

Frage 17: Wie schätzen Sie die folgenden Fragestellungen ein? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|---|
| Wir fühlen uns als Kommune ausreichend über das Konzept des Eurodistrikts informiert |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wir würden gerne verstärkt in den Umsetzungsprozess integriert werden |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Für unsere Kommune sehen wir überwiegend Vorteile durch den Eurodistrikt |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Das Konzept der Förderung der Wachstumsmotoren stellt das raumordnerische Postulat der Herstellung gleichwertiger Lebensverhältnisse in Frage |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |

Frage 18: Wie geeignet halten Sie das Konzept des Eurodistrikts bzw. der Metropolregion für die im Folgenden angeführten Themenfelder? Bitte benoten Sie auf der angefügten Skala von 1 (trifft voll zu), 2 (trifft zu), 3 (trifft weniger zu) bis 4 (trifft gar nicht zu)

| |
|---|
| Anregung des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Beschleunigung der europäischen Integration |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Förderung von Natur- und Umweltschutz |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bewältigung der Konsequenzen des demographischen Wandels |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Den Auswirkungen der Globalisierung erfolgreich zu begegnen |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Vermehrte Integration der Bevölkerung in den Prozess der Planungspraxis |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Intensivierung der Kooperation zwischen den verschiedenen Planungsebenen (Kommune, Region, Land) |
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> kann ich nicht beurteilen <input type="checkbox"/> Sonstiges <input type="checkbox"/> |

Haben Sie weitere Anregungen?

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Ganz herzlichen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit
Bei Rückfragen und zur Rücksendung des Fragebogens:

Dr. Heidi Megerle
Geographisches Institut der Universität Tübingen
Rümelinstraße 19-23, 72070 Tübingen
Tel.: 07071-2976095
Fax: 07071-295318 (bitte unbedingt zu Händen von Frau Megerle)
Mail: heidi.megerle@uni-tuebingen.de

Implementation of the metropolitan region concept in planning practice was the topic of a recent research project carried out at the university of Tübingen. Key questions include how this policy, aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of metropolitan regions, is implemented, what opportunities it offers and what obstacles and challenges have to be overcome. The extensive empirical investigation presented here focuses on the actual implementation process in Baden-Württemberg, which presents a multi-faceted implementation landscape with a variety of different approaches, including the oldest and youngest generation of accredited metropolitan regions as well as cross-border areas of influence.

The analysis of surveys of community officials combined with extensive interviews with stakeholders and planning authorities provides insight into a dynamic process and highlights significant differences in planning and implementation practices. A considerable gap is revealed between planning theory and practice, especially in terms of flexible geometries and metropolitan governance structures. The increasing discrepancy between functional and administrative territories has led to over-extension trends as well as to fears of marginalisation. The envisaged concept of large scale communities of responsibility lacked transparency and credibility for actors in rural areas, leading to fears of being left behind from the development in agglomeration areas.

Die Umsetzung des Konzeptes der Metropolregionen in der planerischen Praxis war Hauptthema eines kürzlich an der Universität Tübingen abgeschlossenen Forschungsvorhabens. Zu den zentralen Fragen zählten Chancen, Hemmnisse und Herausforderungen bei der praktischen Umsetzung einer Politik, die auf Verbesserung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von Metropolregionen zielt. Bei der hier vorgestellten umfangreichen empirischen Studie liegt der Schwerpunkt auf dem Umsetzungsprozess in Baden-Württemberg. Dieses Bundesland bietet eine vielfältige Umsetzungslandschaft, die durch eine Vielzahl unterschiedlicher Ansätze geprägt ist. Dazu zählen sowohl die älteste als auch die jüngste Generation anerkannter Metropolregionen sowie grenzüberschreitende Einflussbereiche.

Die Auswertung einer bei den Gemeindeverwaltungen durchgeführten Befragung – in Verbindung mit ausführlichen Interviews mit sonstigen Akteuren und Planungsbehörden – ermöglicht Einblick in einen dynamischen Prozess und weist auf signifikante Unterschiede sowohl bei der Planung als auch bei der Umsetzung hin. Erkennbar wird eine beträchtliche Lücke zwischen Theorie und Praxis, vor allem im Bereich der flexiblen Geometrien und bei den Strukturen der *metropolitan governance*. Die zunehmende Diskrepanz zwischen Funktions- und Verwaltungsräumen führt zu Tendenzen der Überdimensionierung und zu Marginalisierungsängsten. Bei dem vorgesehenen Konzept der großflächigen Verantwortungsgemeinschaften fehlte es für die Akteure in ländlichen Räumen an Transparenz und an Glaubwürdigkeit. Dazu zählte auch die Befürchtung der Abkopplung von der in den Agglomerationsräumen stattfindenden Entwicklung.